DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 564	IR 001 933
TITLE	Report of the Commission On Librarianship at Stanford.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Libraries.
PUB DATE	Mar 75
NOTE	144p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Stanford University Libraries, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Communication (Thought Transfer); Employment Practices; *Governing Boards; Job Analysis; *Librarians; Library Instruction; Library Research; Library Role; Library Surveys; Personnel Data; Personnel Evaluation; *Personnel Policy; Professional Continuing Education; *Professional Recognition; Questionnaires; Sabbatical Leaves; Salaries; *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Stanford University

ABSTRACT

The Commission on Librarianship at Stanford was created in May, 1972, to examine the role and status of librarians at the university including professional relationships, effective use of librarians, salaries and personnel practices, and the involvement of librarians in the library and university environment. The Commission's study groups conducted their inquiry through literature reviews and through questionnaires distributed at Stanford and at other academic and research libraries in the United States. The prime recommendation of the study was that a Librarian's Assembly be founded consisting of all librarians at the university. The assembly would serve to improve communication between librarians, increase staff involvement in policy formation, and formulate recommendations to the chief library administrative officers on library operations and personnel policies. The study also examined the role and responsibilities of Stanford librarians in terms of collection development, bibliographic control, public service, library instruction, and management. Twenty-two additional recommendations were made concerning salaries, personnel classification schedules, personnel practices, and employment benefits for librarians. (SL)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED108564

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION
ON LIBRARIANSHIP AT STANFORD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

March 1975

IR 001 933

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON LIBRARIANSHIP AT STANFORD

Garrett H. Bowles, Chairman
Judith A. Moomaw, Vice-Chairman
William P. Allan
Robert H. Breyfogle
Jean L. Finch
Sandra K. Korn
Janice M. Lane
Frederick C. Lynden
Coralia Serafim
Carol Turner

March 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Background: the Commission on Librarianship 1

II. The Primary Recommendation: Librarians' Assembly 7

III. Responsibilities and Functions of Stanford Librarians 13
  A. Collection Development 14
  B. Bibliographic Control 15
  C. Public Service 16
  D. Library Instruction 17
  E. Generalist/Specialist 21
  F. Management 23

IV. Professional Concerns 31
  A. Appointment, Compensation, Work Environment 31
    1. Criteria for Appointment 31
    2. Appointment Procedure 34
    3. Classification 35
    4. Compensation 43
    5. Working Environment 56
    6. Security of Employment 61
    7. Peer Review 63
    8. Appeals Procedure 66
  B. Professional Development 67
    1. Orientation 67
    2. Career Counseling 68
    3. Professional Organizations 69
    4. Professional Leave 70
    5. Continuing Education 71
  C. Recognition and Status 74
    1. Instructor/Librarian 76
    2. Academic Council 76
    3. University Committees 78
    4. Faculty Relationships 78
  D. Equality and Uniformity 81
    1. Status of Women in Librarianship 81
    2. Coordinate Libraries 84

V. Implementation 90

VI. Bibliography 93

APPENDICES
  I - Charge to the Commission on Librarianship at Stanford 103
  II - Professional Salary Adjustments, by Earl Borgeson 105
  III - Stanford Librarians' Questionnaire 107
  IV - Librarians' Status Questionnaire 112
  V - Peer Review Questionnaire 118
  VI - Library Organization Questionnaire 120
  VII - Historical Background 122
  VIII - Summary of Recommendations 128

I. BACKGROUND: THE COMMISSION ON LIBRARIANSHIP

The Commission on Librarianship at Stanford was created in May, 1972, by David C. Weber, Director of University Libraries, with the encouragement of the Stanford University Librarians Association (SULA) and the University Library Council. Its charge was

> to examine the role and status of librarians at the University, including:
> - professional relationships within the University,
> - means of facilitating the effective use of librarians,
> - suitable recognition of the services of librarians to the community,
> - aspects of appointment, promotion and perquisites,
> - involvement of librarians in formal and informal teaching, and other aspects of their working environment.

In addition, the Commission was to consider "the question of the most effective forum or organization through which librarians can, as individuals and as a university professional group, share in concern for and contribution to higher education, research, and institutional governance and development" (1).

The Commission was intended to be representative of all librarians at Stanford. It initially comprised five men and seven women, reflecting the male/female ratio in the libraries (2), and representing all ranks,

---

1) See Appendix I for the charge.

2) There are 77 women librarians and 42 men librarians in all the libraries at Stanford, excluding directors and, in the case of the Hoover Institution, faculty members who serve as curators.

years of experience, job assignments and responsibilities. Professional experience ranged from less than one to more than thirty-five years. Job assignments spanned reference, cataloging and acquisitions in undergraduate, graduate, branch and coordinate libraries. Responsibilities ranged from those of a beginning professional to those of a senior administrator. Educational backgrounds also varied. All members of the Commission had a bachelor's degree in a subject field and a professional degree in libarianship; some had graduate subject degrees, master's or doctorate, or were working toward such degrees. Ten members were from the University Libraries and two were from the Coordinate Libraries. Of the original twelve members of the Commission, two resigned: one due to illness; the other due to early retirement. One replacement was appointed (3).

There have been three phases of the Commission's investigation. During the first phase of investigation, the Commission formed two subcommittees: the Role of the Library and the Librarian, and the Recognition of the Library and the Librarian. Each subcommittee undertook an exhaustive literature search and engaged in investigative discussions which were developed into a questionnaire probing various

---

3) Since the Commission began several members have been promoted: to Librarian II, Janice M. Lane (1974); to Librarian III, Robert H. Breyfogle (1973); and to Librarian IV, Jean L. Finch (1973), Sandra K. Korn (1974), and Frederick C. Lynden (1973). Carol Turner transferred to Technical Information Services and then to Government Documents. April Stenzel and Jack Plotkin resigned during the first year of the Commission. Peter Stangl was appointed as a replacement, but unofficially withdrew. Coralia Serafim resigned from the Hoover Institution in September, 1974, although she continued to contribute to this report. See also Appendix I.

aspects of librarianship at Stanford (4). Another questionnaire was developed and sent to selected academic and research libraries throughout the United States in an attempt to gather detailed information concerning the library community (5). The results of these two questionnaires were tabulated, and the Commission then called a meeting for all librarians at Stanford to discuss the data obtained from the questionnaires and to inform the staff of the future plans of the Commission.

In early 1973 the Commission divided into five study groups, each responsible for a specific area of librarianship: library instruction; peer review; library organization; definition, classification, and criteria for appointment and promotion; and salaries. Each study group reviewed the pertinent literature, sent questionnaires to other institutions (6), and examined the situation of librarians and other professionals at Stanford past and present, in relation to its topic. Individual reports, summarizing findings and making recommendations, were then compiled. Throughout this phase the Commission often met in a committee of the whole to discuss various aspects of the study groups' investigations. During December, 1973, and January, 1974, the Commission distributed working papers which were summaries of study

---

4) The Stanford Librarians' Questionnaire was distributed in November, 1972. See Appendix III.

5) See Appendix IV.

6) See the Peer Review Questionnaire and the Library Organization Questionnaire in Appendices V and VI.

group reports and invited all Stanford librarians to discuss these papers in a series of open meetings.

The last period of the Commission's work, leading to the preparation of the final report, began in February, 1974. Data gathered in the two earlier phases were restudied, updated, and in some cases tabulated for succinct presentation as appendices to the report. The most logical organization of the material became the subject of continuing debate. As consensus on the report's final form began to emerge, the responsibility for the writing of its constituent parts was assigned either to individual members or subgroups of two or three persons. Some of these papers drew heavily upon earlier working reports and their constructive criticisms by the assembled professional staff of the libraries and by individual readers in the library administration. The necessity of treating additional aspects of librarianship became apparent only in this stage of the Commission's existence, and papers on them had to be prepared on the basis of additional research. Much time was expended also in criticizing and revising each paper as it was presented at Commission meetings, and in adjusting the separate papers to the total report. By this process, however, the completed document has become in fact the joint effort of the Commission and its members' mutual responsibility.

In fulfilling its charge, the Commission has concentrated upon the role and status of librarians at Stanford, guided by the belief that appropriate recognition of the services of librarians will enable them to contribute more effectively toward the goals of the University.

Preservation of knowledge, according to the report of the Committee on the Professoriate (7), is the major function of the library in the university. Equally important is access to the collection, which can best be achieved through the full utilization of the librarians' professional skills.

The changes which have occurred in both the general library world and Stanford's educational environment make it incumbent upon librarians at Stanford to reevaluate the quality and relevance of their services to the University community. Two extensive reviews of education at Stanford (i.e., Study of Education at Stanford, Study of Graduate Education at Stanford), as well as a trend toward interdisciplinary studies, have substantially affected the services the libraries must provide. New services are required and some old services are no longer necessary. The rapid growth of the libraries at Stanford to their current position of eighth in size of collections among the academic libraries of the nation, along with the greater variety of materials (e.g., microforms, video tapes, sound recordings) with the attendant complexities of handling them, has also led to a reexamination of library services.

Some changes in services have already occurred. Stanford has significantly contributed toward improved access to library materials through the development of a computer-produced book catalog for the J. Henry Meyer Memorial Library and of Project BALLOTS (Bibliographic

---

7) Stanford University. Committee on the Professoriate at Stanford. Report. (Stanford: 1974), p.39.

Automation of Large Library Operations using a Time-sharing System), the automation of the Library's technical services using on-line files. In addition, Stanford has strengthened its collection development program by the compilation of a comprehensive selection guide, the creation of a staff of curators, and the adoption of a strong affirmative statement on intellectual freedom in the library.

Every activity of the librarian is ultimately directed toward serving faculty, students, and other scholarly researchers. The objective of superior service can best be achieved through the realization of the professional role of the librarian and the effective utilization of librarians' special talents and skills. Further improvement in services can be attained by establishing a Librarians' Assembly, which will maintain professional standards and encourage more effective communication between librarians and their clientele under the protection of intellectual freedom.

II. THE PRIMARY RECOMMENDATION: LIBRARIANS' ASSEMBLY

The Librarians' Assembly is the single most important recommendation to come from this study. While there currently exists a librarians' organization (SULA), the Commission believes that a Librarians' Assembly, whose membership automatically encompasses all librarians and which works in close cooperation with the libraries' administrations for the development of the profession, will provide an effective unifying force for librarians. The improved communication and involvement of librarians in all aspects of library operations at Stanford are necessary "to give meaning to librarianship within the university environment ...[and] for action that will achieve a suitable working environment for librarians" (8).

Because the Librarians' Assembly is referred to throughout this report, we have described it here, leaving the supporting arguments of particular aspects of the Assembly for later development.

RECOMMENDATION 1

A Librarians' Assembly should be created which would automatically include in its membership all professionals employed at Stanford in the

---

8) See the Charge to the Commission on Librarianship at Stanford in Appendix I.

Librarian or Library Director series. Other professional classifications in the libraries may be admitted as members of the Assembly upon recommendation of its Executive Board and approval by the Assembly.

I. PURPOSES OF THE ASSEMBLY:

A. To increase communication among librarians of the University.

B. To provide a forum for discussion and exploration of issues of concern to librarians.

C. To provide all librarians in the various libraries of the University with a regular and effective means of participating in the formulation of policies and procedures which affect the role and recognition of librarians.

D. To discuss and make recommendations in the following areas to the chief administrative officers of the libraries of the University:

1. Appointments, promotions, grievances, and security of employment.
2. Librarians' welfare and development.
3. Library policy and planning
4. Selection and development of collections.
5. Public services.
6. Technical services.

E. To represent the library to the Academic Council of the University in order that librarians may participate more actively in the governance of the University.

II. EXECUTIVE BOARD:

A. The Executive Board of the Librarians' Assembly should be elected by the Assembly.

B. All members of the Executive Board should be elected for two-year terms with one-half of the Board elected for a one-year term when the Assembly is begun.

C. No one in the Library Director series should be eligible for election to the Board.

D. The Executive Board should include mandatory representation of librarians from the Coordinate Libraries.

E. Functions of the Executive Board:

1. To call and conduct meetings of the Assembly.
2. To set the agenda for the meetings of the Assembly.
3. To establish ad hoc committees and appoint members to both standing and ad hoc committees.
4. To serve as an advisory board to the Director of Libraries and the chief administrative officers of the Coordinate Libraries. All Assembly and committee recommendations should be transmitted to the Director of Libraries and chief adminiStrative officers through the Executive Board.
5. To propose and develop bylaws.

F. The Executive Board should meet at least once a month and conduct the business of the Assembly between its general meetings.

III. FUNDING:

The University Libraries and the Coordinate Libraries should cover basic and necessary operating expenses of the Assembly on a proportional basis. Members should not be required to pay dues, and all meetings and Assembly business could be conducted on library time.

IV. MEETINGS:

A. The Librarians' Assembly should meet at least once every quarter. Special meetings should be called by the Executive Board, or as a result of a petition signed by 25% of the Assembly, or at the request of the University Library Council.

B. The Director of University Libraries and the chief administrative officers of the Coordinate Libraries should annually report to the Assembly on the state of the libraries.

C. The Executive Board should submit a written agenda for the general meetings of the Librarians' Assembly to the membership at least two working days in advance of the meeting.

V. COMMITTEES:

A. The Assembly should establish the following standing committees:

1. The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment should participate in the selection and appointment process for librarians, and establish and administer a peer review system for promotions and for security of employment.

2. The Committee on Professional Development should be concerned with coordination of staff development activities among all the campus libraries. This committee should devise a uniform policy of staff development for professionals, disseminate information on staff development, and make recommendations on requests for professional leaves and travel funds.
3. The Committee on Public and Technical Services should review on a regular basis the utilization of staff, and the goals and objectives of public and technical service units, recommending improvement of services based upon this review; and coordinate public and technical service activities of the campus libraries.
4. The Committee on Library Instruction should supervise and coordinate an effective program of library instruction for all of Stanford's libraries.
5. The Committee on Committees should review the standing committees each year, consider recommendations for new standing committees, and propose appointments to committees.

B. The Assembly may recommend the creation of special and ad hoc committees to the Executive Board. These recommendations should be referred to the Committee on Committees.

VI. POWERS OF THE ASSEMBLY:

All recommendations of the Assembly should be considered advisory. The final power to change policies and procedures remains with the University and the library administrations. It is the intention of the Commission that the Assembly encourage active participation of all librarians in the decision making processes of the libraries in order to give them a voice in the determination of policies which affect their role as professionals.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES AND FUNCTIONS OF STANFORD LIBRARIANS

Librarians are specialists in information science and collection management. "The librarian's responsibility is to be academically informed, to be one who studies the advances in his profession and provides the finest possible service to his institution, to make the library a genuine teaching agency, and to be one who is deeply interested and involved in the entire instructional and research process of his institution" (9).

The librarians at Stanford are professionals currently holding the rank of "Librarian" or "Library Director." They constitute only 30% of the total library staff. Most have graduated from an accredited library school and hold a Master of Library Science (MLS) degree or its equivalent. About a third hold additional master's or doctorate degrees in subject fields other than librarianship. Because half the collection is not in English, they have in the aggregate a competence in over 50 languages.

Librarians have major responsibilities in collection development, bibliographical control, public service, and library instruction. Their ultimate objectives in acquiring, preserving, organizing, and managing

---

9) Weber, David C. "An Approach to the Academic Status of Librarians." California Librarian 29 (1968), p.140-1.

library materials are to facilitate access to them and to provide concomitant bibliographical services. A complex of abilities is needed for effective performance in each of these areas.

A. COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

This area of librarianship is strongly dependent upon effective communication between librarians and faculty; the faculty has a responsibility to inform the library of materials needed for current and projected research and teaching, while librarians have the responsibility of maintaining an equitable and consistent growth of the collections and informing the faculty of the direction of and constraints upon the collections' development. This interchange is especially essential and beneficial as research materials become more complex in their format and their retrieval. In times of growing financial restraints the competition for University funds and the shrinking value of the dollar combine to make the selection of library materials more difficult and challenging. Librarians then must make judgments weighing the cost of each potential acquisition with its desirability. This requires a knowledge of the goals of the University, and of the areas in which Stanford has traditionally maintained strong collections. Librarians who select materials require competence in particular subject areas and an ability to ascertain and fill gaps in the general collection. In addition, they need to be aware of the world-wide availability of print and nonprint materials and to develop and manage University book funds for the greatest growth and strength of the libraries' collections.

B. BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL

This area of librarianship is principally concerned with providing access to the collections through the organization and control of materials. The librarians' expertise is demonstrated in interpretations and judgments that best organize the materials for access and administration. The catalog, regardless of its format, is often the first point of consultation for the use of the library's holdings, and it is the responsibility of the librarian to supervise its maintenance for maximum effectiveness. Qualifications for catalogers include a knowledge of the subject(s) of the materials to be processed and of the language(s) of their texts, a recognition of the significant features of bibliographic description and identification, a mastery of international cataloging principles necessary for the consistent integration of materials in Stanford's catalogs and in national and other bibliographies, and an ability to utilize automation for bibliographic control.

The sharing of bibliographic information has been growing since the turn of the century when the Library of Congress began to make its cataloging data available to the public. In a large research library bibliographic information for more than half the materials acquired is thus readily available from reliable sources (10). These materials are therefore processed by the clerical support staff, leaving the professional only those materials which require originally created

---

10) e.g., The National Union Catalog, the Catalog of the British Museum, Library of Congress Catalog - Books: Subjects.

cataloging. By transmitting copies of all original cataloging to the Library of Congress, librarians create in turn the National Union Catalog, the single most valuable bibliographical apparatus in this country. The advent of machine-readable cataloging has increased this shared use of national and even international information and is leading to a greater utilization of the cataloger's talents.

C. PUBLIC SERVICE

Public service includes the answering of specific reference questions, formal and informal instruction in the use of the library, and preparation of bibliographies and guides published and distributed by the library. Among the librarians at Stanford who have direct public service responsibilities are reference librarians and branch librarians.

Reference service requires an ability to communicate clearly and to interpret precisely the questions and information needs of library users. It entails guidance to and provision of information, often from beyond the confines of the local community or of libraries themselves, through utilization of the librarians' skills, initiative, subject expertise, and knowledge of reference materials, library collections, computerized data banks and other sources. Librarians make a distinction between "reference" questions which require such skills and knowledge, and "information" questions which are locational or "quick-answer." Librarians are concerned with the former; other staff members are trained to handle the latter. It is not uncommon for public service librarians at Stanford to spend thirty minutes to an hour with students or faculty members, conducting research interviews and guiding them to relevant bibliographies, indexes and sources. Even the more routine reference questions are opportunities to teach library skills.

Public service does not always require direct contact with library users. Librarians use their subject knowledge and bibliographical expertise to prepare guides, collection surveys and other bibliographies of materials in Stanford's libraries.

D. LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

Library instruction is usually described as an extension of traditional reference service, but some differences between the two should be noted. Reference is typically a departmental function, involving a particular group of librarians. Library instruction is programmatic and draws its participants from every unit of the library, wherever the best teaching abilities are to be found. It affirms the professional unity of all librarians. In addition, reference encounters provide patrons with only a fragmentary understanding of the library's resources, whereas a course such as Library I is designed to provide as comprehensive a view as possible of the entire library system and the most effective access to its collections. Reference service can have the effect of assuring the patron's continued dependence on librarians for assistance, but the focus of library instruction is always to encourage the patron's self-reliance through acquired knowledge. Library instruction involves the librarian in classroom teaching, like the faculty; reference service only suggests the analogy.

The need for a planned and coherent program of library instruction at Stanford has developed with the growth and complexity of library resources and services and with the changing character of both the curriculum and the student body.

The library collections at Stanford grow at the rate of about 150,000 items a year and now aggregate over four million books, journals and reports, about two million manuscripts, 700,000 microforms, 130,000 prints and pictures, 120,000 maps and 100,000 sound recordings. These materials are dispersed in over thirty libraries under the direction of seven distinct library administrations. In the interest of economy, these units tend to be mutually exclusive in their collection responsibilities. However, several libraries may have interests in different facets of the same general subject, as in economics or psychology. Research strategies may therefore have to be varied, depending upon the subject matter under investigation, the medium in which it has been published or otherwise preserved, and the library or department in which it is located. In overcoming these difficulties experience has proved for many researchers to be an adequate, perhaps even a good, teacher; but it is not the most efficient.

Paradoxically, as library research has grown more challenging, more students have elected or been required to undertake it. The trend in undergraduate education, especially, has been toward independent study and research papers, in place of highly formalized lecture type of instruction with its insistence on prescribed reading and blue book examinations. This movement has been accelerated by the recommendations of the Study of Education at Stanford, published in 1968. The emphasis now is increasingly on the relevance of education to social issues and responsibilities, which require a broader sweep of learning through interschool, interdepartmental, and even extradepartmental programs of study. In a recent article on university libraries, President Lyman has drawn attention to this development: "the growth of new combinations of subject matter within courses ...[and] the tendency to value independent study ...[have alerted research libraries to their] greater usage from students now veering from the Reserve Book Room to the stacks, and the greater need for cross-referencing, both in bibliographic tools and by skilled reference librarians" (11). He recognizes too that students will need more help from librarians if they are to make effective use of the available collections, and that the university has an obligation to provide more funds to this end.

The Stanford libraries have already made progress in providing a range of instruction which includes orientation tours and presentations by librarians before special subject interest groups, and credit courses in bibliography (12). But except for the Library I course in general bibliography and library use, these courses seem to have come into being as a result of the inspiration and enterprise of individual librarians and a few cooperative departments. Major departments, judged by the number of their students, such as History, English, Economics, or

---

11) Lyman, Richard W. "New Trends in Higher Education: the Impact on the University Library." College and Research Libraries 33 (1972), p.300.

12) See listings under the heading "Libraries" in Courses and Degrees, Stanford University, issued annually.

Psychology, are not represented in this group. What needs to be developed, actively promoted, and conscientiously coordinated is a broader program of library instruction.

RECOMMENDATION 2

A coherent and logically organized program of library instruction should be developed by the Stanford University Libraries and the Coordinate Libraries. This program should be supervised and coordinated by a Library Instruction Committee representative of all the major library units. Library I should be continued and vigorously promoted, and instructors should be drawn from all interested and qualified librarians. The present involvement of librarians in departmental teaching programs should also be actively encouraged. For librarians solely responsible for teaching a course, a minimum of 25% of their work load should be allocated to this important effort. Apportionate time should be allocated for team teaching. The ideal should be a broad range of instructional assignments, methods, and materials to insure the most effective utilization of the library's resources by its patrons.

E. GENERALIST/SPECIALIST

Librarians who function effectively in a university setting may be characterized as both generalists and specialists. Their primary specialization, librarianship, "provides an integrated approach to the utilization of knowledge" (13). In addition, there has been an increasing recognition in large and complex libraries of the need for staff to possess competence in an academic discipline along with demonstrated abilities in librarianship. Subject or area specialists, familiar with the literature and research in a particular field and adept in utilizing its bibliographic apparatus, provide superior library service. By combining knowledge of an academic discipline with the professional skills of the traditional functions of acquisition, cataloging, and reference, they facilitate specialized library services such as preparation of bibliographies, provision of in-depth research assistance and formal instruction in subject bibliography courses. In addition, the subject specialist librarian, serving as a link between the library and a department of instruction, is in a good position to recognize and respond to new developments and changing needs in that department's research and teaching.

Although they may possess a doctorate in a subject field, librarians contribute most usefully to the university by functioning as generalists in what is essentially a specialist's environment. This is both the

---

13) Harlow, Neal A. "The Uncertain Librarian," as quoted by Carolyn I. Whitenack in "The Changing Role of the Librarian and his Relationship to Educational Media." In Educational Media in Libraries, edited by Carl H. Melinat. (Syracuse, N.Y.: 1963).

librarian's greatest problem and greatest strength (14). Even when assigned to a specific subject field, the librarian must be a generalist within that area. For example, the engineering librarian serves a school composed of faculty, research staff, and students, many of whom are working in highly specialized areas. That librarian's "specialty" cannot be limited to one or even several narrow subject areas but must encompass the bibliographic apparatus of all of engineering and related fields.

The assumption of a generalist's posture by librarians is absolutely essential if the library is to meet the current and future needs of its clientele by providing materials and services in both traditional academic disciplines and the newer interdisciplinary studies programs.

Ideally, every Stanford librarian should function as a generalist/specialist. Developing and maintaining productive relationships with faculty and evaluating and integrating current and potential library resources and services should be primary responsibilities. The designated specialty of some librarians cuts across disciplines (i.e., form specialties such as serials, government documents, manuscripts, etc.). Most librarians, however, should offer subject expertise as their specialty and serve as library liaisons with individual academic departments. This kind of assignment would utilize the unique skills of the professional librarian, foster better communication with faculty,

---

14) Christ, John M. "The Identity of Educational Librarians." In Toward a Philosophy of Educational Librarianship. (Littleton, Col.: Libraries Unlimited, 1972), p.112-25.

and insure that the library is meeting the current and future research needs of academic departments. It would require that there be adequate support staff to carry out the day-to-day routine tasks of the libraries and that librarians have a minimum number of scheduled desk and/or office hours per week.

F. MANAGEMENT

It is the difficult task of the university library to combine the elements of a service-oriented profession with those of a production-oriented organization. In order to unify these dual obligations and make them function well together, a large and complex library system such as Stanford's employs a diverse staff ranging from clerical and technical support personnel to librarians and other professionals (programmers, architects, financial managers, etc.). Among these, the librarians are, by virtue of their training in librarianship, in the best position to have a knowledge of the whole range of library operations and an understanding of their interrelationships. Individually and as a professional group, it is they who are ultimately responsible for the library's success or failure in meeting its goals.

Because of this responsibility, it is essential that librarians participate in library decision making. The ramifications of an administrative decision cannot be foreseen without the input and participation of those librarians who are immediately responsible for the areas that will be affected by a decision. Furthermore, management experts in the field of business have long recognized that participation is a sound method for increasing productivity. "Participation tends to increase commitment, commitment tends to heighten motivation, motivation tends to make management work harder and more productively, and harder and more productive work tends to enhance the company's prosperity; therefore, participation is good" (15). Higher morale, improved efficiency, and more effective decisions and planning can occur when all librarians are given greater opportunity to participate in the decision making process and the responsibility for carrying out those decisions in areas that affect their work.

The rapid growth of the Stanford libraries during the last decade has tended to decrease actual participation by individual librarians in decision making. As the libraries' administrative strata have grown, more and more decisions have been made by top level administration without effective input by librarians. Librarians frequently complain that they are consulted too late or only as a formality when decisions affecting their work have already been made by the administration. In the Stanford Librarians' Questionnaire, more than half of the respondents reported dissatisfaction with existing lines of communication between themselves and library administration. If the libraries are to attain their objectives and remain a dynamic and essential part of the University, they must build an open and creative

---

15) Beach, David N., and Walter R. Mahler. "Management by Objectives." In The Failure of Success, edited by Alfred J.Marrow. (New York: Amacom, 1972), p.235.

environment in which each librarian shares in the responsibility for meeting individual and common goals.

> The creative organization may be best described as one that maintains an atmosphere of involvement, one that encourages employees to become fully participative. An environment should exist that encourages society or groups of peers rather than a rigid hierarchy; there should be a relative lack of social distance between the employees and their supervisors at every echelon of management. Because the individual is the organization's most important resource, major focus should be placed on providing him with the things he needs to enable him to work at his best. Work should be challenging, interesting, and personally rewarding, and assignments, responsibility, and authority should be delegated with this aim in mind. A great deal of trust should be placed in each person; there should be a minimum of controls, constraints, and external forces telling him how to do his job, and formal policies, procedures, and standards should provide a platform from which he can operate rather than a set of inflexible rules confining him (16).

An open and creative atmosphere, characterized by professional respect and trust, can be fostered in Stanford's libraries by the convening of a Librarians' Assembly which will involve all librarians in discussion and study of matters of professional concern. Participation can be increased in individual library units through such methods as management by objectives and collegial decision making.

In its discussions of library management, the Commission has noted three areas of special concern: the structuring of individual jobs; the ratio of professional to support staff; and the preparation of librarians and other staff members for supervisory and management responsibilities. These areas are interrelated.

---

16) Lahti, Robert E. *Innovative College Management*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p.16.

Structuring jobs so that they are interesting and challenging for the individual, while meeting organizational goals, is a common problem in organizations. At Stanford most librarians (67%) are satisfied with the scope of their jobs, although half of the librarians have expressed an interest in gaining experience in other library departments (17). It is the judgment of the Commission that flexible scheduling (18) and the restructuring of some library jobs to allow better utilization of subject expertise (e.g., assignments as library-academic department liaisons) or broader knowledge of library skills (e.g., assignments combining public service and technical service duties) would be beneficial.

The overriding problem, however, for librarians generally and for many of those at Stanford is that their jobs contain an unreasonable amount of clerical work (19). In some areas of the libraries the number of support staff is not sufficient to handle the many clerical tasks of library operations. Too often typing, filing, and routine correspondence fall to the more highly paid librarian, while professional tasks may be neglected due to the pressures of daily operations.

---

17) See the Stanford Librarians Questionnaire, numbers 21 and 29 in Appendix III.

18) See Section IV.A.5.

19) 67% of the respondents to the Stanford Librarians' Questionnaire (see Appendix III) said they are required to do an unreasonable amount of clerical work.

In order to determine staffing needs and suitable professional/support staff ratios, individual library units should analyze their component tasks and assign to support staff all duties not requiring professional judgment.

One duty that might be carefully considered for reassignment to support staff is supervision. Direct supervision, which is both time-consuming and encumbered with clerical tasks, generally does not require the kind of skills gained through training in librarianship. In many of the production-oriented operations of the library, such as shelving books, maintaining circulation files, and binding, supervision need not and should not be done by librarians.

In order to operate most efficiently the libraries must broaden the supervisory and managerial skills of their staffs. For those who are given supervisory or administrative assignments at Stanford, the libraries should offer "local situation" in-house workshops dealing with Library and University forms, regulations, policies, and procedures. In addition, supervisors should be encouraged to take courses in personnel relations and management (20). For librarians and paraprofessionals with assignments requiring substantial managerial skills, this type of training (supported by library funds set aside for this purpose) should be mandatory.

---

20) See also Section IV.B.5.

RECOMMENDATION 3

Given the complex nature of Stanford's libraries, good management is essential for the effective functioning of the production-oriented library operations and for the facilitation of the proper role of professionals. To promote good management practices, the Commission recommends the following:

1. Every effort should be made to increase responsible staff involvement in decision making and to institute participatory management throughout the libraries. Participatory management, as envisioned by the Commission, would include the following elements:
   - a. Decisions should be made at the level of responsibility whenever possible.
   - b. Input, ideas, opinions, and feedback from the staff should be sought whenever major new policies, changes, reorganizations, or plans are contemplated. Major decisions (e.g., procedural changes and new policies) should be made after consultation with those affected, rather than by mandate from the top.
   - c. On major policies affecting the role or status of librarians, the Executive Board of the Librarians' Assembly should serve as an advisory group to assure that the professional aspects and implications of the policy are presented and taken into consideration.

2. For the most effective utilization of personnel, all areas not involving professional judgment and decision making should be the province of the support staff. To assure and reward excellence among the support staff, paraprofessional positions should be provided for areas requiring highly competent performance and the assumption of substantial responsibilities. The Commission recommends that each major library unit establish its own ad hoc committee to determine the most effective ratio of support staff to professional staff in each library. Each committee should be composed of members from the units concerned, including librarians, support staff, and administration.

3. In order to develop and effectively utilize supervisory and managerial skills, the libraries should inaugurate a continuing management training program. This program, administered by the Library Personnel Office for all the libraries and with the advice of the Professional Development Committee of the Librarians' Assembly, should comprise the following elements:
   a. In-house "local situation" workshops dealing with Library and University forms, regulations, procedures, and policies should be offered on a regular basis to staff members with supervisory responsibilities. Additional workshops should be organized to cover special situations such as major changes in library or University policies.
   b. Management training, supported by the University's Staff Training Assistance Program funds or by library monies set aside for this purpose, should be more actively encouraged for any

staff member seriously considering a supervisory or managerial career in the libraries.

c. Management training should be mandatory for staff members in positions requiring substantial managerial skills. These positions include department heads, assistant department heads, branch librarians, division heads, and supervisors of three or more full time equivalent employees.

4. A hierarchy is not the only viable form of organization for libraries and, in fact, some units could function more effectively with (and librarians themselves could benefit from) a more collegial type of organization. Therefore, the Commission recommends that at least one department or library experiment with a collegial arrangement for the next three to five years. Under a collegial arrangement (a form of organization commonly used in academic departments) decisions are made by a group of peers headed by an elected chairperson. In the library the peer group should comprise all professionals in a particular unit. The individual selected as chairperson should be paid an administrative stipend for the length of time in that position. This arrangement should not preclude participation by support staff in the management of the unit. It should, however, encourage involvement in and sharing of administrative duties and responsibilities among the professional staff.

IV. PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS

Carrying out its charge to examine the role and status of librarians at Stanford, the Commission made a detailed study of professional concerns in four general areas:

A. Appointment, Compensation, Work Environment

B. Professional Development

C. Status and Recognition

D. Equality and Uniformity

A. APPOINTMENT, COMPENSATION, WORK ENVIRONMENT

1. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT

One characteristic of a profession is the establishment and enforcement of standards for its members. Members of most professions must have a license, a credential or a specific educational degree. For example, nurses are registered, engineers are licensed, and lawyers must pass the bar examination. In each of these examples, certain basic skills and knowledge are necessary in order for a person to function competently as a member of that profession. The same is true in librarianship. The basic bibliographic skills and an understanding of overall library operations and systems are needed for a librarian to perform most effectively as a professional in any functional or subject specialty.

In some professions the national association assumes the responsibility for, or strong leadership in, establishing and imposing standards of membership. Unfortunately, no library association has taken on that role. Nor has the government required that an individual be licensed or obtain a credential in order to perform as a librarian in other than public school or civil service jobs. Each library, therefore, sets its own standards. In most libraries the MLS degree or its equivalent is a minimum standard for hiring anyone as a librarian. Such is not currently the practice at Stanford.

The Commission believes that the attainment of the MLS degree is an important qualification. Those hired as librarians who have an MLS are more versatile, have a better understanding and overview of the whole library operation and have a deeper commitment to the library profession than those without such a degree. Members of the support staff who have been promoted to the Librarian series generally know only the job in which they have worked for many years. In addition their career opportunities are limited. Although they may perform outstandingly, they seldom change from the job and the library in which they have been promoted because they do not have the broad knowledge of librarianship evidenced by the MLS degree. Occasionally professionals with diverse backgrounds not including library training are hired to meet specific needs in the library. Recognizing the contribution these professionals make, the Commission suggests that they be assigned a unique classification rather than be included in the Librarian series. For example, there could be a classification for archivists (Archivist I, II, III) and for curators (Curator I, II, III).

RECOMMENDATION 4

The Commission recommends the following criteria for appointment to the Librarian series:

1. Librarian (Beginning or Librarian I). An MLS from an American Library Association accredited library school or equivalent library training. Reading knowledge of at least one but preferably two foreign languages. Graduate work, master's degree or doctorate in a related subject field is highly desirable.
2. Librarian (other than beginning). Meet the requirements of beginning librarian in addition to demonstrated competence in previous professional position(s), outstanding recommendations and involvement in professional organizations and activities.

The Commission recommends the following criteria for appointment to library administrative and management positions (Assistant Department Chief and above):

1. Must have had some formal management training or agree to complete at least one management course during the first year of employment.
2. Should have demonstrated or potential administrative, managerial, or supervisory abilities.
3. Should have an MLS degree or enough experience in library work to understand library operations, relationships, and terminology.

Those not meeting the criteria for appointment to beginning Librarian should not be given the title or rank of Librarian nor should they be responsible for performance appraisals of librarians.

2. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURE

Another concern is the procedure for appointment. Many universities provide Trustees' or Corporation appointments for librarians. Although the appointment of all librarians at Stanford through the Provost's or President's Office was routine until about 1958 or 1959, such appointments are now made through the Personnel and Employee Relations Department which has the final judgment. Stanford librarians, unlike librarians in other universities, do not receive tenure or a "continuing" appointment. Librarians in the University Libraries do, hovever, have an informal "continuing" appointment.

RECOMMENDATION 5

Since librarians classed above Librarian I are appointed as the result of national or international searches and extensive interviewing, the appointment should appropriately go via the Provost and be confirmed by the Board of Trustees. A document of appointment should be signed by the Secretary to the Board of Trustees, giving the term of appointment and the title or classification of the librarian as an "academic officer" of the University. This form of appointment would help substantially to remove the implication that librarians serve in a subordinate position, rather than in a professional one. A form of appointment that is essentially the same as the faculty's would recognize the status and function of the librarian as an academic colleague of the faculty.

3. CLASSIFICATION

Academic libraries generally use some kind of a classification system to indicate the relative value of jobs and individual performance in those jobs. Ideally such a classification system has levels or ranks which indicate abilities, skills, and knowledge; degree of responsibility; and/or professional contributions. There are three basic classification systems in general use, and a fourth which is found in a few libraries:

1. Numbered Ranking. An example of this classification system (Librarian I, II, III, and IV in ascending order) presently obtains in the Stanford University Libraries. This classification system is also used by the Coordinate Libraries, although these libraries do not necessarily utilize the descriptions prevailing in the University Libraries for comparable positions. There is also a Directors series at Stanford. These ranks (Assistant Director, Associate Director, and Director) are reserved for the top administrative positions in the libraries and could be compared with academic deans.
2. Faculty Title and Status. This system is used in institutions that classify their librarians as faculty. For example, at the University of Minnesota Libraries there are four ranks of librarians: Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, and the professional staff of the library is organized as a faculty. At Purdue University librarians hold the titles of Assistant Professor of Library Science, Associate

Professor of Library Science, and Professor of Library Science and constitute the Faculty of the Libraries and Audio-Visual Center. Stanford librarians do not have faculty status, and, given the present climate of opinion on the campus, it is not likely they will attain faculty status in the foreseeable future.

3. Academic Titles without Faculty Status. This classification system uses titles which parallel faculty ranks. Such a system is currently used by the University of California, which has three ranks: Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian. It is modeled on faculty classification and perhaps would identify librarians more closely with teaching faculty. Some libraries have hoped that adoption of such titles (along with higher criteria and standards for promotion to emulate the faculty) would lead to higher salary scales and faculty status, but this has proved illusory (21).

SULA proposed the adoption of this sort of system for librarians over three years ago (22), but the proposal was tabled by the Personnel and Employee Relations Department on the basis that the system was not compatible with other academic (non-faculty) professional titles. Further discussion of this proposal was delayed when the Commission was formed.

---

21) For example, librarians in the California State Universities and Colleges system have been granted faculty status, but are not paid salaries equivalent to their faculty's.

22) Stanford University Librarians Association. Draft Report on Nomenclature. (Stanford: 1971).

4. Unirank System with Functional Titles. In this system every librarian has the title Librarian in addition to a functional title, such as Bibliographer or Serials Librarian. This system is not in wide use. One major institution, Michigan State University, indicated in the Librarians' Status Questionnaire that it was using the titles Librarian and Divisional Librarian.

The classification system currently in use in the Stanford libraries presents a number of problems:

1. There are no written criteria for advancement, and the language describing the ranks is vague or, in certain cases in the Coordinate Libraries, nonexistent. This results in inequities in the application of the ranking system.

2. Benefits and perquisites are dependent upon rank. "This disparity has had a deleterious effect on the professional staff and is indeed difficult to justify. TIAA/CREF is available at the Librarian II level; Faculty Club membership, campus housing, and reserve parking are available at Librarian III level; and Librarian IV's are eligible for research or sabbatical leave. (Only the Director of Libraries and the Librarian of the Law Library are members of the Academic Council)" (23).

---

23) Letter from David C. Weber to Colin Pittendrigh, Aug. 17, 1973, p.4. Since that letter was written, campus housing is no longer available to librarians.

3. As the system is presently applied, it is generally necessary to assume administrative or managerial responsibilities to advance to the highest ranks.

4. The current definitions of rank provide no incentive for increasing competence by advanced study or by participation in professional activities.

5. Promotion to a higher classification does not necessarily mean a commensurate salary increase at the time of the promotion. This occurs because promotions in the University Libraries are considered separately from and subsequent to the recommendations for salary increases.

There can be problems with any ranking system, but it should be possible to establish criteria which will insure that the system adopted is understandable to all and predictable and equitable in its application. Any classification system is acceptable at Stanford if the following standards are universally applied:

1. The criteria for appointment and promotion to each rank must be clearly and publicly specified in as much detail as feasible.

2. Librarians whose jobs require subject or bibliographic expertise should be able to advance to higher ranks without assuming administrative duties.

3. A fixed salary structure stating the salary maximums and minimums for each rank, rather than a summary of paid rates, should be instituted so that librarians can evaluate the monetary rewards for advancement from one rank to another. All salary increases for promotions should be made at the time the promotion is effective and should fall within the stated range for that rank (24).

4. To assure the equitable application of these criteria to all librarians at Stanford, the Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment of the Librarians' Assembly should review the administration of the classification schedule through the peer review process.

RECOMMENDATION 6

After studying alternative classifications, the Commission concluded that the present system, adequately defined, would properly fulfill the requirements of an effective classification with a minimum of disruption. In general, the proposed system is designed to provide all librarians with the opportunity to advance into the highest classification through increased professional competence.

---

24) See Section IV.A.4.

LIBRARIAN I. The beginning professional level.

CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT: The criteria stated in Section IV.A.1, above, should be met. No experience is required, and appointees to this rank will have no more than three years of professional experience.

YEARS IN RANK: The librarian can expect to remain in this grade an average of two years and a maximum of three years. No librarian shall begin a third year in this rank without a clear understanding of the level of achievement expected in order to be promoted to the next rank. If not promoted at the end of three years, the librarian will be given six months' notice and will be expected to leave the service of the library.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS CLASSIFIED IN THIS RANK: Performs a variety of professional duties under careful supervision in preparation for more independent responsibility. Ideally, incumbents in this grade would acquire experience through rotating assignments in acquisitions, cataloging, public service, and administration.

The following ranks are all career grades and a librarian may remain in any one indefinitely. However, promotion from Librarian II to Librarian IV should normally occur in ten years.

LIBRARIAN II. The first career grade in the Librarian series.

CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT: In addition to the criteria stated in Section IV.A.1, above, the following is desirable: equivalent rank in the previous position or a minimum of two years of professional experience. Advanced degrees relevant to the job assignment can fulfill a part of the years of experience criterion.

YEARS IN RANK: The librarian can expect to remain in this rank a minimum of two years or an average of five years before promotion.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS CLASSIFIED IN THIS RANK: Majority of duties are performed independently. Some management of other professionals can be expected. This rank involves subject specialization as well as application of professional library procedures.

LIBRARIAN III. The second career grade in the Librarian series.

CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT: In addition to the criteria stated in Section IV.A.1, above, the following is desirable: equivalent rank in the previous position or a minimum of four years of professional experience. Advanced degrees relevant to the job assignment can fulfill a part of the years of experience criterion.

YEARS IN RANK: The librarian can expect to remain in this rank a minimum of two years or an average of five years before promotion.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS CLASSIFIED IN THIS RANK: Performs complex professional duties with independence. Does original cataloging and classification of difficult material, engages in advanced reference work which involves consultation with faculty, or performs specialized services (e.g., as instructor or curator), administers a division of the library, manages a branch library, assists chief of a department.

LIBRARIAN IV. The final career grade in the Librarian series.

CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT: In addition to the criteria stated in Section IV.A.1, above, the following is desirable: a master's or higher degree in a subject field, and equivalent rank in the previous position or a minimum of six years of professional experience. Advanced degrees relevant to the job assignment can fulfill a part of the years of experience criterion.

YEARS IN RANK: The librarian can expect to remain in this rank permanently.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS CLASSIFIED IN THIS RANK: Makes unique professional contributions (e.g., evidences expertise in the resources of a specialized subject, form, language, or geographic area), does complex analytical work on procedures for major aspects of a library's operation, or has substantial administrative responsibilities (e.g., administers a department of a library).

4. COMPENSATION

Certain assumptions are made about professionals. They all possess expertise in their particular field; they all have certain educational qualifications; all theoretically are endowed with sufficient judgment to organize and successfully accomplish their assignments. These assumptions, among others, can be made of librarians as well as of engineers, social workers, etc.

Salaries and benefits are the most tangible measures of a professional's recognition within an institution. A salary structure which is designed to respond to exceptional abilities and performance, to the professional growth of an individual, and to increased effectiveness from continuing experience is of utmost importance. According to the Stanford Librarians' Questionnaire, 66% of Stanford librarians felt that their salaries were inadequate. The investigations of the Commission support this view.

Currently salaries of librarians in the Stanford University Libraries are determined by the Directors after reviewing the evaluations written by the librarians themselves and their supervisors, along with any pertinent documents staff members may have placed in their individual files (25). Generally, therefore, several persons are involved in the salary adjustment process for each librarian (26). Salary

---

25) Borgeson, Earl. Professional Salary Adjustments - Present Practices, March 19, 1974. See Appendix II.

26) Coordinate Libraries have their own procedure. Many coordinate librarians have no input in their salary adjustments, even in an

recommendations go to the Provost's Office for review with regard to University policy and salary adjustment guidelines. When these recommendations are approved and then verified in writing, they are submitted to the Personnel and Employee Relations Department's Compensation Section (27).

The Compensation Section strives for a midmarket position in salaries for librarians and other exempt employees (28). This means that, after defining the market for a particular group, Stanford will attempt to pay salaries falling into the middle range for that group, rather than the highest or the lowest salaries. Consequently, the definition of the librarian market is of utmost importance.

The Stanford University Libraries system traditionally compares salaries within the Seven Universities Group comprising Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale. It is

---

evaluation process. Some receive their salary notices later than those in the University Libraries system, some before. Although Coordinate Libraries generally follow the same schedule of paid rates as the University Libraries, there is no official standard requiring them to do so.

27) This process generally begins in early spring with evaluations and ends sometime in August with the salary notifications. The Commission feels that the process is too long. August is very late for people to begin looking for a new position in the event that they are dissatisfied with the new salary or are not promoted to career status. They also miss the opportunity to look for and interview for new positions at the annual American Library Association conference, usually held in late June. Most research libraries recruit and hire in the spring or early summer for the fiscal years of July 1 - June 30 or September 1 - August 31. Fewer jobs are available after August.

28) Exempt employees are those staff members who are salaried and normally do not receive pay for overtime work under Fair Labor Standards Act regulations.

TABLE 1
Hourly Salary Comparison

	salary	hrs/wk.	vacation	sick	hrs/yr.(c)	$/hour
Cornell	11,900	40(a)	22	12	1816	6.55
Columbia	11,700	35	23	10(b)	1596	7.33
Stanford	11,600	40	20	10	1848	6.28
Harvard	11,000	35	30	10(b)	1547	7.11
Yale	10,800	37.5	26	20	1612.5	6.70

Source: salary represents the median salary taken from Association of Research Libraries. ARL Annual Salary Survey, 1972/73. (Washington: 1973). Hours per week, vacation, and sick leave figures are from the Librarians' Status Questionnaire (See Appendix IV).

Notes: a) Cornell has an unspecified work week; for purposes of this comparison it is set at 40 hours although, in conformance with the practice of most eastern universities, the work week would probably be between 35 and 37.5 hours.

b) No limit is applied to sick leave; for purposes of this comparison it is set as equal to Stanford's.

c) Hours per year are derived from the following formula: (261 work days per year - vacation - sick leave) x (hours per week/5).

inaccurate to say that Stanford is midmarket in relation to these universities solely on the basis of salary median, without taking into consideration the number of hours worked per week and the length of vacation and sick leave. Of the five libraries in this group for which we have adequate information, the middle position of Stanford's median salary is belied by the actual dollar per hour which it represents (See Table 1). Stanford's median, in fact, represents the lowest compensation in the list, rather than the midpoint.

The Commission believes it is more meaningful to compare Stanford librarians' salaries with those of other California librarians, especially those in the Bay Area. Comparison of median salaries from a group of Bay Area libraries surveyed by the Commission shows that Stanford's median salary generally is in the lower half of the list (See Table 2). Included in this survey were libraries in the University of

TABLE 2
San Francisco Bay Area Salary Comparisons
(Highest to Lowest Median)

1973/74 Rank		1972/73	1973/74
1.	University of California, Davis	13,824	15,648
2.	Hewlett/Packard Co., Inc., Library	14,732	15,589
3.	Palo Alto City Library	13,200	15,100
4/5	San Jose State University Library	12,504	13,440
4/5	Cal. St. Univ., Hayward, Library	12,504	13,440
6.	Contra Costa Co. Library	11,316	12,168
7.	Alameda Co. Public Library	11,460	12,000
8.	Stanford University Libraries	11,100	11,600
9.	Lockheed, Tech. Info. Center	10,765	11,544
10.	Mills College Library	10,500	10,825

Source: Inquiries to 22 Bay Area institutions; 15 responded. Medians were not supplied by 5, including the community college libraries.

Note: The University of California at Davis and Stanford University are the only members of the Association of Research Libraries on this list.

California and the California State University and College systems, as well as community college, public, and special libraires. The survey confirmed that Stanford's librarians' salaries are under midmarket and far below those of community college libraries, which make fewer intellectual demands on their librarians, and government libraries (29).

Stanford will slip even lower in this scale, if present trends continue. Table 3 shows that median salaries of University of California librarians are increasing at a faster rate than Stanford's.

---

29) Examples of federal libraries in the Bay Area are the following: Housing and Urban Development Library, San Francisco; U. S. Veterans Administration Hospital Library, Palo Alto; Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Library; and the U. S. Geological Survey Library, Menlo Park. Beginning librarians are classified at GS9, with salaries ranging from $12,167 - 15,821. The second step is GS11, $14,671 - 19,072. Figures are from the Federal Register, 31037 (Nov. 9, 1973).

TABLE 3
Median Salaries for Five California Libraries

		1969/70	1970/71	1971/72	1972/73	Increase 69-72
1.	U.C., Davis	11,388	11,670	11,952	13,824	21%
2.	U.C., Berkeley	11,112	11,952	11,952	13,152	18%
3.	U.C., Los Angeles	10,800	11,112	11,112	12,828	20%
4.	Stanford	10,000	10,000	11,000	11,100*	11%
5.	Univ. of So. Calif.	9,200	9,500	9,900	10,050	9%

Source: Association of Research Libraries. *ARL Annual Salary Survey, 1969/70-1972/73*. (Washington: 1970-73).
* Professional salary information from Stanford University Libraries.

In addition to a depressed overall salary structure, there is the problem of Stanford librarians' salaries clustering in the middle positions. This appears to indicate that beginning salaries are raised from year to year to reflect market considerations and cost-of-living increases, but the more experienced librarians in the middle ranges receive only an annual percentage merit increase.

A comparison of the 1974 salaries paid to librarians at Stanford University and at the University of California, Berkeley, emphasizes this point (See Table 4). Fifty percent of Berkeley's librarians receive higher salaries than seventy-five percent of Stanford's. In fact, only the top six percent of Stanford's librarians are making as much or more than Berkeley's top twenty-five percent.

Berkeley's highest salary is $1,060 more than Stanford's; its beginning salary is $672 more, and there is a wide discrepancy in distribution. Berkeley's salary distribution approaches a "bell" curve;

TABLE 4
Salary Distribution (Actually paid)

	Stanford (67 librarians)	Berkeley (135 librarians)
Top salary:	$21,200	$22,260
75 percentile:	$14,800	$17,496
50 percentile:	$12,900	$15,984
25 percentile:	$11,600	$13,884
Beginning salary:	$ 9,900	$10,572

Source: California. University. Salary Survey, University of California Librarians. (Berkeley: 1974).

Note: salaries from the Coordinate Libraries at Stanford were not available for this comparison; however, figures from earlier years show that their inclusion would not have substantially changed these statistics.

$5,412 separates the beginning salary from the median and $6,276 separates the median salary from the top. Stanford's, on the other hand, appears to be bottom heavy; only $3,000 separates the bottom salary from the median while $8,300 separates the median from the top.

Inconsistencies in salary adjustment policies exist among the various Stanford libraries under the present system, which has no stated standards and no published salary structure. Because promotions in the University Libraries are decided after salary recommendations are made, promotion from one rank to another does not necessarily mean a higher salary than the expected annual merit increase. In addition, there is no across-the-board upgrading of salaries when the beginning and ending salaries are raised each year. Salaries of librarians in the middle ranges, which are not raised proportionally, tend to fall behind. It is conceivable that a Librarian I, after one year's experience, could earn the salary then current for a beginning Librarian I (30). At Stanford, librarians' salaries are dependent upon the first salaries they received because all increases are a percentage of the salary they received the year before.

In lieu of a published salary structure, such as the nonexempt staff's 6/11-Step Range Structure or the curve ranges (C-Ranges) which most other professional groups are assigned, the University Libraries' Director's Office issues a table of paid rates, showing the lowest, highest, and median salaries for each librarian rank and a total median (See Table 5). This table is compiled after salary adjustments are made for the year, making it impossible for individuals to know the salary which they might expect or aspire to the next year. Moreover, this table does not show whether they are being compensated fairly in relation to their performance and to their peers with comparable responsibilities and experience. The Coordinate Libraries apparently make use of this table for determining their salaries. A published salary structure, such as a C-Range, as opposed to a summary of paid rates issued after salary adjustments are made, is necessary each year for the following reasons: to know one's potential within the system; to be able to compare one's salary increase with one's evaluation, i.e., to see whether one is being compensated fairly in relation to one's performance; to see how one's salary compares to others in the system

---

30) For example, if a Librarian I, with no prior experience, began in 1973/74 at base minimum of $8,800 and received a 7% merit increase, his or her next year's salary would be $9,416. This is only $16 above the base minimum for 1974/75, at which another new librarian, with no experience, would start.

TABLE 5
Stanford University Libraries
Summary of Salary Rates Paid to Librarians

	1973/74			1974/75		
Position	Number of Positions	Range of Paid Rates	Median	Number of Positions	Range of Paid Rates	Median
Librarian I	7(9.2%)	9,000* 9,400	9,200	3(4.3%)	9,900* 10,100	10,000
Librarian II	27(35.5%)	9,800 11,900	10,900	25(36.3%)	10,000 13,200	11,600
Librarian III	26(34.2%)	11,000 16,400	12,800	26(37.7%)	11,800 16,700	13,700
Librarian IV	16(21.1%)	13,700 20,000	15,500	15(21.7%)	14,700 21,200	15,800
Total	76**(100%)	9,000 20,000	11,600	69**(100%)	9,900 21,200	12,900

* The base minimum for 1973/74 was $8,800 and for 1974/75 was $9,400.
** Does not include administrative professionals and the Directors (nine positions).

who have comparable experience and qualifications; and to use as a factor in considering employment opportunities within or outside the system.

It may be useful to consider salary structures in general. A salary structure determines how individuals are compensated relative to each other within the same professional group. A step-salary structure is graduated through stated salary intervals. This system is presently used for both the professional and support staff in the libraries of the University of California system and for the nonexempt employees at Stanford. The entire structure is raised in response to the cost of living, and merit increases are determined by step advancement, e.g., moving from step 1 to step 2. Advancement in this kind of structure is generally according to a fixed number of steps, and is consequently considered less flexible than a range structure, but provides more predictability.

A C-Range structure is defined by the use of two curves representing a minimum and maximum salary range. Within these curves an employee is placed according to years of applicable experience and level of performance. A C-Range could be used with any classification system, e.g., multirank or unirank.

At Stanford curve ranges are used for exempt employees. The Personnel and Employee Relations Department's Compensation Section assigns most professional groups to one or more specific C-Ranges, designated C-3 through C-10 (See Table 6).

The Commission attempted to determine the librarians' place among Stanford's professionals, by comparing job descriptions and requirements and by charting librarians' salaries on existing C-Ranges. None of the other professional groups comparable to librarians are classed below the 1973/74 C-5 range (31). The social worker classification, for which a master's degree is generally desired, does not belong to a designated salary range, but starting salaries were $11,000 - $12,000 per annum (1973/74) as compared with the librarians' starting salary of $9,000 ($9,000 was the actual paid rate; $8,800 was the base minimum). Social

---

31) See Stanford University. Personnel and Employee Relations Department. Job Classification and Pay Plan. (Stanford: 197-+).

TABLE 6
Examples of C-Ranges

	1973/74		1974/75
C-4 range:	$8,328-10,128	(lower curve)	$8,700-10,596
	$9,192-12,312	(upper curve)	$9,648-13,044
C-5 range:	$9,192-11,160	(lower curve)	$9,600-11,664
	$10,128-13,584	(upper curve)	$10,632-14,400
C-6 range:	$10,128-12,312	(lower curve)	$10,632-12,924
	$11,160-15,720	(upper curve)	$11,832-16,824
C-7 range:	$11,736-14,256	(lower curve)	$12,360-15,036
	$12,936-18,192	(upper curve)	$14,616-19,560
C-8 range:	$13,584-16,488	(lower curve)	$14,328-17,400
	$14,976-21,072	(upper curve)	$16,776-22,548
C-9 range:	$15,720-19,104	(lower curve)	$16,584-20,148
	$17,328-24,384	(upper curve)	$19,056-25,836
C-10 range:	$18,192-22,104	(lower curve)	$18,924-22,992
	$20,064-28,224	(upper curve)	$22,056-29,772

Source: Stanford University. Personnel and Employee Relations Office. Compensation Section.

workers parallel librarians somewhat in that master's degrees are desired for both, both are service professions, and both have traditionally been thought of as women's professions.

Librarians' salaries begin substantially lower than those of other professionals at Stanford. A mapping of librarians' salaries onto the C-Ranges shows that Librarians I are between the C-3 and C-4 ranges (Compare Tables 5 and 6). Librarians II, the largest class of librarians in the University, fit within the C-4 range, while C-5 is usually the starting range of other professionals on campus. A comparison of Stanford's C-Ranges with the University of California

TABLE 7
University of California, Berkeley
Academic Librarian Salary Ranges

	7/1/73 Annual		7/1/74 Annual	
	Lowest	Highest	Lowest	Highest
Assistant Librarian:	$8,724	$12,276	$9,864	$13,560
Associate Librarian:	$11,412	$16,020	$12,648	$17,496
Librarian:	$15,276	$20,532	$16,716	$22,260

Source: CU News, The General Library, University of California at Berkeley, v.29, no.26 (July 18, 1974).

salary schedule indicates that librarians at Berkeley would be on Stanford's C-6 through C-9 ranges (Compare Tables 6 and 7).

The following criteria should be applied to the librarians' salary scale, requiring:

1. A salary scale or structure, such as the one at the University of California at Berkeley, published every year, prior to salary adjustments, as opposed to a summary of actual paid rates which is issued after salaries have been adjusted for the year.

2. A scale which provides a higher salary for promotion to another rank, in addition to the expected annual merit increase.

3. An overall percentage increase across the board to compensate for market factors.

4. A scale which places librarians in an equitable salary position to the San Francisco Bay Area market and to other professionals at Stanford with comparable requirements and contributions.

RECOMMENDATION 7

The Commission recommends:

1. That the Stanford librarians' market be defined as university, college, and research libraries in the San Francisco Bay Area. This list should include libraries in the University of California system, the California State Universities and Colleges system, the various community colleges, and special libraries. Stanford competes with these libraries for qualified professional staff, and positions in these libraries are similar in scope and requirements to positions at Stanford. Also, the cost-of-living factors in the Bay Area are comparable. The high-market position would include most government libraries, i.e., federal, state, and metropolitan area public libraries.

2. That Stanford University librarians' salaries be upgraded to the level of comparable professional salaries in this area: 30% increase across the board retroactive to September 1, 1974.

3. That the libraries of Stanford University aim for a mid-market salary position and that an overall percentage increase be made annually to compensate for market factors.

4. That the present compensation system be replaced by a published structure.

5. That librarians be assigned as follows to the C-Ranges: LI-LIV to the C-6 through C-9 ranges.

6. That the new structure allow for higher salaries when promotion occurs or additional responsibilities are assumed, in addition to the expected annual merit increase.

7. That the new structure place librarians in an equitable salary position to the San Francisco Bay Area market and to other professionals at Stanford with comparable requirements and contributions.

5. WORKING ENVIRONMENT

Stanford librarians' realization of their full potential as professionals, and consequently their success in providing needed information services to the University community, are dependent upon many factors. Two related factors which affect librarians' morale, job satisfaction and performance are the time constraints and the physical surroundings in which they work.

Most Stanford librarians are required by their library administrations to work a forty-hour week, and the majority of librarians at Stanford adhere to a rigid work schedule of Monday through Friday from 8 to 5, with prescribed time limits for lunch hours and coffee breaks. The few exceptions to this schedule occur principally among librarians responsible for staffing public service points, who are required to work some evening and weekend hours. There is a growing need for technical service personnel to have the option to work a flexible schedule as a means of increasing access to computer terminals.

Adoption of flexible scheduling is on the increase in business and manufacturing establishments, and is being tried in academic and other types of libraries (32). These experiments have not been limited to professional employees. At Stanford the J. Hugh Jackson Library of Business has introduced a variation on the 8 to 5 work day. Staff

---

32) McKann, Michael R. "Flextime at Florida." Library Journal 73 (1973): 3231-34 and Vinnes, Norman. "The Four-day Week." Library Journal 73 (1973): 1550-52.

members are still required to work eight hours a day, Monday through Friday, on a fixed schedule, but starting and ending times and length of lunch hour can be adjusted to suit the individual's needs or preference. According to the participants, even with just this small degree of variation the program has been very successful and has contributed to higher morale (33).

Flexible scheduling has been instituted as one reflection of a growing trend toward humanization of working environments. Individuals have varying responsibilities and demands on their time away from work. Body rhythms and personal preferences are unique, so that different people are at their peak working form at different times of day. Work space is less crowded and the wear and tear of rush hour traffic can be avoided. Alienation is lessened and morale is improved by not having one's time strictly controlled by an employer.

Considerations such as these have been behind the introduction of flexible scheduling in libraries. They are valid reasons, but the Commission believes that the issue of librarians as professionals is the true heart of the matter. A system that does not schedule work hours, monitor coffee breaks and tally the sick leave of its librarians affirms in a very obvious way that they are professionals. It is based on the assumption that librarians have sufficient intelligence, judgment and

---

33) Makovics, Lesley. "Flexible Scheduling at Jackson Library." Library Bulletin of the Stanford University Libraries, v.26, no.20 (June 17, 1974): 81-82.

sense of responsibility to accomplish their duties without close supervision.

The Commission's concept of flexible scheduling is less restrictive than the applications we have encountered in the business world or in most other libraries and approaches the flexible work patterns of the faculty. It entails providing more options of when and where to work. In view of the legitimate time constraints imposed by library operations and by the requirements of maintaining communication, each librarian should have stated and posted office or public service desk hours. Aside from these hours, work time should be unscheduled, with librarians free to choose the best time and place to discharge their obligations to the library and to the people it serves. Depending on the situation, this might be in the library building, whenever it is open; on another part of the campus; or off campus, even at home.

Constraints of time are closely related to those of space. According to the Stanford Librarians' Questionnaire, 64% of Stanford librarians queried by the Commission believed that their physical surroundings and facilities did not contribute to the efficient performance of their jobs. The Main Library and many other campus libraries are old and overcrowded. Staff work space is at a premium, and offices or conference rooms in which librarians can work without constant interruption are few indeed. Even in newer buildings there are problems. The J. Henry Meyer Memorial Library, one of the newest library buildings, is a model of humanization of the environment for readers. The staff, however, is in very cramped quarters, with the reference librarians' desks crowded into what is in effect a corridor.

All librarians are expected to do a large amount of intellectual work. They need quiet and some degree of privacy to enable them to concentrate. For librarians at the lower ranks, suitable office space is almost nonexistent. In the typing pool environment where many librarians work it is virtually impossible to think, let alone concentrate for any extended period of time.

RECOMMENDATION 8

1. The Commission recommends flexible work scheduling for librarians, whenever it is compatible with the basic daily operations of the library. It does so in the conviction that not only is this measure of independence inseparable from professional status but that its implementation will promote higher morale and improve library efficiency.

2. Overcrowding can be alleviated to some extent by flexible time scheduling, which would decrease the number of people in an office at any given time. It would also allow work requiring concentration to be done in a place other than the library.

3. Even with the present limited space, improvements can be made. Plans for new library buildings must include greater consideration of staff space needs in terms of both quantity and quality.

   a. Librarians should have access to their work areas whenever the library building is open. Keys should be available for check-out at public service desks by those who have not been issued their own.

   b. Present work space should be examined to determine the need for and feasibility of providing partitions around desks, particularly in very large work areas.

   c. A number of study carrels should be available for use by librarians.

   d. In dealing with the University concerning space assignments, the libraries should strongly express and support the need for appropriate and adequate office and conference space for professional staff.

   e. The Librarians' Assembly should be involved in plans for new library buildings. The ultimate structures will benefit from the variety of viewpoints and expertise available among librarians, resulting in efficient storage of library materials as well as a congenial environment conducive to professional work and research.

6. SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT

There is a history of concern among Stanford librarians about the insecurity of their employment. SULA has, almost from its inception, been concerned about this problem, and the report of its Library Classification Committee in January, 1969, included an investigation of security of employment for Stanford's librarians. However, no action was taken on its recommendations. The need for a security of employment system was therefore studied in a paper prepared for the Commission. The justification for such a system was summarized in this manner (34):

1. The principle of security of employment, though subject to growing criticism in recent years, has been even more recently reaffirmed as a basic cornerstone of employment conditions for intellectual workers in academia by study groups at both the national and local (Stanford) levels.
2. The principle of security of employment is part of a system which involves the following key elements:
    a. A guarantee of academic or intellectual freedom.
    b. After a reasonable probationary period, dismissal is only for adequate cause -- duly specified -- short of retirement or physical incapacity.
    c. Dismissals for adequate cause are subject to academic due process, also duly specified.
    d. Peer participation, at least in the admission to security of employment and in the dismissal for adequate cause, as part of the guaranteed due process.
3. Librarians in general have been urged by their national professional association to adopt security of employment statements for the last 28 years, and a new declaration of that statement is in process.

---

34) Johnson, Peter. Career Status and Tenure. (Stanford: 1974), p.18-19.

4. Stanford librarians are now almost completely lacking in any formal, professional security of employment system, having only those minimal employment safeguards which they share with other Stanford employees.

RECOMMENDATION 9

To insure that termination of Stanford librarians is for unsatisfactory performance, and not for reasons such as defending intellectual freedom (35), espousing unpopular causes, sustaining ideological differences, or questioning administrative decisions, a system of security of employment should be established. To accomplish this, a committee of the Librarians' Assembly should be formed to write a detailed document on security of employment that incorporates the basic elements listed under number two, above. This document should be based on 1) the Association of College and Research Libraries Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians (36) and 2) the Stanford University Librarians Association's Security of Employment statement (37).

---

35) Stanford University. Libraries. Intellectual Freedom and the Stanford University Libraries. It was endorsed by the University Library Council, Jan. 11, 1972; approved by the Academic Council Committee on Libraries, Apr. 4, 1972; and approved by the Academic Senate, Apr. 27, 1972.

36) Association of College and Research Libraries. "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians." College and Research Libraries News, no.8 (1973): 192-95, and its "Appendixes." College and Research Libraries News, no.9 (1973): 243-47.

37) Stanford University Librarians Association. Security of Employment: Draft. (Stanford: 1971).

7. PEER REVIEW

As a peer group with commonly accepted professional standards, librarians are the best judges of their colleagues' work. A peer review system is important for the development of a strong collegial profession and may be defined as involvement of a group of colleagues in the process of appointment, promotion, and security of employment.

A system of peer review has several advantages over the hierarchical evaluation system traditionally used in most libraries, including those at Stanford. Written criteria are generally used in peer review so that all individuals know on what basis they are being judged. Also, written criteria help insure consistency in the application of standards. Another advantage, and one frequently mentioned by librarians who have a peer review system (38), is the involvement of librarians as peers in the review process. There are two aspects to this involvement. First, it tends to raise staff morale because librarians feel they have a meaningful voice in the appointment and promotion process. Secondly, the decision making process is strengthened and broadened by the additional input of the peer group.

A major benefit of peer review is that it stimulates professionalism. It is most often based on criteria which stress professional growth and achievement; thus librarians using a peer review system judge themselves and each other in such terms. Involvement of librarians as colleagues

---

38) According to responses to the Peer Review Questionnaire; see Appendix V.

in the review process makes for better understanding of professional standards and of professional contributions to the effectiveness of the library and the university as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION 10

A peer review process is deemed important for the development of a strong collegial profession; therefore, the Commission recommends that all Stanford librarians be included in such a process.

The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment of the Librarians' Assembly should review all permanent appointments, promotions and elevations to career status.

The Committee should consist of five members appointed for overlapping two-year terms by the Executive Board of the Librarians' Assembly in consultation with the chief administrative officers (e.g., Director, Librarian) of the participating libraries.

The Committee should make recommendations to the chief administrative officer of the appropriate library based upon documentation supplied by the supervisor(s) and the librarian being reviewed. The librarian should be informed of the recommendations made at each level of the procedure.

Documentation should include a written evaluation by the supervisor, which must occur at intervals of no more than three years nor less than six months. Within those limits, evaluations should be obligatory for any of the following reasons:

1. Librarian's request
2. Change in job assignment
3. Change in supervisor
4. Recommendation for promotion or elevation to career status
5. Supervisor's request
6. Library administration's request

The evaluation should be concerned with job performance (75%) and professional development (25%).

The review process for promotion should normally be initiated by a supervisor's recommendation, but librarians should have the option to request their own promotion review. Elevation to career status should be considered on a timetable to be devised by the Librarians' Assembly.

The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment should have the authority to appoint ad hoc promotion review committees which would report their findings to it. This committee would judge the qualifications of only the final candidates for appointment to the Librarian series.

8. APPEALS PROCEDURE

Stanford librarians should have access to an appeals procedure as an integral part of the peer review process. Although a formal university grievance procedure is available to all Stanford employees (39), the Commission thinks that it would be beneficial for the libraries to establish their own appeals procedure for cases where there is disagreement between a decision of the Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment and the library administration which the librarian wants to appeal. A separate peer committee should ajudicate cases brought before it through the appeals procedure, and its decision should be forwarded to a source outside of the libraries, such as the Provost's Office, for final settlement.

RECOMMENDATION 11

An appeals procedure should be set up for librarians which would cover such problems as dissatisfaction over appointments, promotions, reassignments, security of employment (or career status), and the allocation of travel funds. A committee of peers would hear and judge the appeal and pass on their judgment to a source outside of the libraries, such as the Provost's Office. The specific mechanics of the procedure should be worked out and voted on by the Librarians' Assembly.

---

39) Stanford University. Guide: Administrative Organization, Policies and Procedures. (Stanford: 1969+), Guide Memo 22.10.

B. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Librarianship is a rapidly changing field, and new skills and continuing education are needed for librarians to keep up to date with the most advanced concepts in automation, management theories, bibliographic control, and service to the community. Professional development is, therefore, of great importance both to libraries and to individual librarians. Among the best means of promoting this development are participation in professional organizations, professional leave, and continuing education.

RECOMMENDATION 12

To insure that professional development opportunities are well publicized and made available to all librarians at Stanford, a Committee on Professional Development should be established by the Librarians' Assembly. This committee would be concerned with the coordination and planning of professional development activities for all campus libraries.

1. ORIENTATION

An orientation program is the most expeditious means for introducing newly employed librarians to the organization and resources of the Stanford libraries. It gives them an overview of the total collections and of the relationships among the various libraries on campus. The

University Libraries currently conduct two orientation programs: one for all new staff and one for professionals only.

RECOMMENDATION 13

The existing orientation programs should certainly be continued, but to insure that all librarians at Stanford, including those in the Coordinate Libraries, have the opportunity to participate, the Committee on Professional Development of the Librarians' Assembly should establish a comprehensive orientation program.

2. CAREER COUNSELING

Although many librarians are satisfied and productive in the area of librarianship which they have initially chosen or to which they were assigned, there are others who could profit from career counseling. The Commission believes that a personnel officer trained in career counseling could be of valuable assistance in advising librarians how to realize their particular talents and develop their careers along the most appropriate ladder.

RECOMMENDATION 14

The Commission strongly recommends that the University Libraries provide a career counseling service for all librarians at Stanford and that its Personnel Officer have training in this field.

3. PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Through involvement in national, state, and regional organizations, librarians are able to keep abreast of professional concerns and advances in librarianship and to maintain a perspective much larger than the confines of their specific assignments. Exposure to new and different practices, techniques, and services enhances the professional competence of librarians, and consequently, the effectiveness of the organizations they serve. There is a broad spectrum of professional organizations to which librarians belong. These include general librarians' groups such as SULA, the California Library Association, the Special Libraries Association, and the American Library Association; subject-oriented librarians' groups such as the Music Library Association and the Art Librarians Society; and a host of other subject-related associations such as the American Society for Information Science and the Modern Language Association of America.

Stanford librarians participate in the work of these organizations with the encouragement of most of the administrations of the libraries. The extent to which they can be aided in attending meetings is limited by the funds available. Library Administration Regulation no. 12 states the University Libraries' current policy and guidelines for approval on travel expense reimbursement.

RECOMMENDATION 15

The Commission urges that all University libraries continue to encourage the development and effectiveness of the staff by providing funds for appropriate visits and travel for all librarians, and by increasing the amount of funds allocated for travel reimbursement.

For equitable application of policies regarding travel reimbursement, the Commission recommends that the Committee on Professional Development of the Librarians' Assembly be responsible for reviewing requests for travel funds.

4. PROFESSIONAL LEAVE

The lack of opportunity for all librarians to participate in scholarly research efforts is of major concern. Professional leave with pay is at this time available only to Librarians IV and above. It is important that librarians keep up with the changes in their field and contribute to the advancement of their profession through research and publication.

RECOMMENDATION 16

Professional leave should be made available to all librarians who have career status and have been at Stanford for a minimum of three years. They should be encouraged to make use of it, particularly in the early stages of their careers. A librarian should be eligible for three months professional leave at full salary, or six months at half salary, at intervals of three years. The leave may be used for research or innovation in librarianship or in an academic subject area, or otherwise to pursue a program of professional development that full time employment does not permit.

Professional leave is not free time that comes as a matter of course, like a vacation. There should be a well defined purpose and a written statement of what the applicant expects to accomplish. Because increased expertise is a sufficient end in itself, the product of this leave need not be a written or published document of any kind.

Application should be made by the librarian through administrative channels. At least three copies of the proposal and accompanying forms should be made, one for the administration, one for the Committee on Professional Development of the Librarians' Assembly, and one for the applicant's records. The Committee on Professional Development should act in an advisory capacity to the library administration in the decision making process.

5. CONTINUING EDUCATION

Continuing education is an important part of professional development. To a large extent, librarians continue their education through work experience, contact with colleagues, and professional reading. However, it is important that librarians also have the opportunity to pursue advanced degrees, take courses for credit or audit, and attend workshops or seminars that are relevant to their professional development. At the present time, Stanford librarians have various opportunities to pursue these activities.

Under the Staff Training Assistance Program (40), two kinds of assistance are available to all Stanford librarians: financial assistance and time off with pay. Up to $50 per quarter is available to cover tuition and registration costs. If the tuition exceeds $50 per quarter, the additional costs may be shared by the library and the librarian. Although there is no written University policy concerning the amount of time off with pay for exempt employees (which include librarians), nonexempt employees are allowed up to five hours time off per week per quarter in pursuing an approved training activity. The University Libraries policy is to allow 90 hours per year for such academic work. The Personnel and Employee Relations Department stated that the policy for nonexempt employees could be applied to exempt employees (41), although the latter are usually responsible for determining their own hours of time off for continuing education.

Stanford librarians also have available to them a Tuition Reimbursement Program, which provides assistance to Librarians I and II for graduate study leading to an advanced degree (42). This plan was approved at the July 16, 1969, meeting of the University Library

---

40) _Ibid_. Guide Memo 22.11.

41) Judy Moss in conversation with Janice Lane, July 26, 1974.

42) Stanford University. Libraries. _Library Administrative Regulations_. (Stanford: 1968+), Regulation no. 17.

Council. The proposed degree program should be in a field that is relevant to the applicant's professional development.

RECOMMENDATION 17

All librarians, regardless of rank, should be encouraged to take courses, at Stanford or at other institutions, for credit or audit, and to pursue advanced degrees.

As professionals, they should be responsible for determining their own hours of time off for purposes of continuing education.

Assistance, in terms of time and money, should be provided to the fullest extent possible. Tuition assistance should be available to librarians taking courses during professional leaves.

Area of study should not be limited to subjects pertinent to the individual's present job assignment, but should allow room for growth in other directions as well.

C. RECOGNITION AND STATUS

There is a need for the recognition of librarians at Stanford as professionals engaged as partners in the educational program and objectives of the University. The work of librarians is inextricably tied to the curricular and academic objectives of the University. The books they select, the courses they teach and the services they offer must be compatible with the needs of the researchers, faculty and students at Stanford. To accomplish these tasks in the most effective manner it is imperative that librarians establish lines of communication with the faculty and that they be given a voice in the governance of the University.

The 1972 Stanford Librarians' Questionnaire showed that 56% of the librarians believed their status at Stanford was inadequate. In the belief that inadequate status and lack of appropriate recognition impair the ability of the librarian to be as effective as possible, the Commission considered methods of improvement.

The question of faculty status for librarians continues to be a controversial one among university librarians themselves as well as other academic groups. In 1973 the Council of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of College and Research Libraries adopted the Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians. The statement justifies faculty status for university librarians on the basis that

> ...all members of the academic community are likely to become increasingly dependent on skilled professional guidance in the acquisition and use of library resources as the forms and numbers of these resources multiply, scholarly materials appear in more languages, bibliographical systems become more complicated, and library technology grows increasingly sophisticated. The librarian who provides such guidance plays a major role in the learning process.
>
> Librarians perform a teaching and research role inasmuch as they instruct students formally and informally and advise and assist faculty in their scholarly pursuits.
>
> Where the role of college and university librarians ... requires them to function essentially as part of the faculty, this functional identity should be recognized by granting of faculty status (43).

Although the Commission agrees with these statements concerning academic librarians, we have not recommended faculty status for Stanford librarians at this time. According to the 1972 Stanford Librarians Questionnaire, only 42% of the librarians felt that faculty status should be sought (44). It is highly doubtful that either the faculty or the University administration would grant such a status to Stanford librarians even if recommended at this time. Furthermore, the Commission is aware that in most libraries which have attained faculty status, librarians have had a difficult time advancing beyond the rank of Assistant Professor because their assignments were not restructured to allow them time to meet the teaching and research standards required by their new status. The Commission believes that it is imperative to

---

43) "Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians." College and Research Libraries News, no.8 (1972): 209-10. It was rejected by the third participant, the American Association of Colleges.

44) However, 56% felt that faculty status would improve the lot of librarians; see Appendix III.

restructure jobs as well as raise the appointment criteria for new staff, before requesting faculty status.

1. INSTRUCTOR/LIBRARIAN

There are immediate steps that can be taken to improve librarians' status at Stanford and to assure appropriate recognition. For example, all librarians who teach courses should be given academic titles and rank. Currently, some librarians whose courses are sponsored by an academic department are granted the title of Lecturer and will be members of the adjunct professoriate when the recommendations of the Report of the Committee on the Professoriate are implemented. The librarians who teach Library I are not given any title because the University Libraries is not an academic department.

RECOMMENDATION 18

All librarians who teach formal courses should be given academic title and rank, at least during their term of appointment. For those librarians teaching courses not sponsored by an academic department, ranks and titles could be granted through the Humanities Special Programs.

2. ACADEMIC COUNCIL

The status of librarians and their potential for contributing to the educational goals of the University could be further improved if more librarians were members of the Academic Council (45). Academic Council membership has been sought by and denied to other professionals, and the Commission is aware of the rationale for limiting membership in this body to the teaching faculty. However, there are some librarians who teach courses and others who act as freshman advisors. There are librarians who select books for the research collection and those who work closely with the students and faculty in helping them to locate the bibliographical sources and information they seek. In fact, all librarians at Stanford have an interest in and a contribution to make toward discussions of the curriculum issues and educational policy of the University.

RECOMMENDATION 19

In order to facilitate communication, to improve relationships with the faculty, and to give librarians a more direct voice in the governance of the University, the Commission recommends that representation of librarians in the Academic Council be increased. To achieve this an ad hoc committee of the Librarians' Assembly should be established to work out appropriate criteria and methods.

---

45) At present, only two librarians are members of the Academic Council: David C. Weber, by virtue of his post as Director of University Libraries, and Professor J. Myron Jacobstein because he is a Professor of Law in addition to being the Law Librarian.

3. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

Currently, librarians are invited to serve on University Committees, Presidential Committees and subcommittees of the Academic Council. Such service provides librarians with a broader perspective of the academic community by giving them the opportunity to work with members of the administration, faculty, and student body in conducting the complex business of the University.

RECOMMENDATION 20

The Commission recommends that the practice of appointing librarians to University Committees be continued and increased to give more librarians this type of opportunity to serve the academic community. In addition, librarians should be invited to participate fully on the committees of the Academic Council.

4. FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS

In an academic environment such as Stanford University, continuing interaction, cooperation and good relationships between members of the faculty and librarians are essential for building relevant collections and for providing appropriate levels of library service to a university community. Where such relationships are strongest, the collections and the library services match well the needs of the faculty and students. Where they are weak or nonexistent, problems tend to arise which are costly to the university and frustrating for all concerned.

At Stanford the branch librarians, curators and librarians in the graduate schools (Medicine, Law, and Business) have the closest ties with the faculty. Some librarians are invited to departmental faculty meetings. The Commission believes that such relationships are mutually beneficial; librarians are made aware of the needs of the faculty and faculty learn which library services are available to them and have a better understanding of the problems the libraries face.

However, increasing librarian-faculty interaction is difficult for several reasons. The jobs of most librarians are so structured that they are scheduled to spend most of their time in the library and there is little opportunity for professional interaction with the faculty outside the library environment. Opportunities for contact on a social level are even more limited. For example, Librarians I and II are excluded from membership in the Faculty Club. Although some librarians teach classes, they are not allowed to be members of the Academic Council. Librarians III and IV are no longer eligible for campus housing.

RECOMMENDATION 21

The Commission believes that it is important for librarians to take the initiative in increasing faculty-librarian contact. One way in which this could be accomplished is by appointing a librarian (preferably one with an advanced subject degree) as a selector for each academic department. The librarian and the faculty could discuss library needs and problems and communicate any new programs or specialties which might have an impact on their mutual areas of interest. Such dialogue, even in a formal way, would lead to better understanding and the accomplishment of common goals.

D. EQUALITY AND UNIFORMITY

Throughout their deliberations, the Commission members emphasized that special efforts must be made to insure equality of opportunity and uniformity of standards for librarians in all libraries at Stanford. This emphasis led to two special studies, with recommendations, regarding 1) the status of women in the profession and 2) the Coordinate Libraries.

1. STATUS OF WOMEN IN LIBRARIANSHIP

Studies on sex discrimination in libraries, such as the one undertaken at the University of California at Berkeley (46), have demonstrated that librarians are often the lowest paid professional group in a university because librarianship is considered a woman's profession. The Berkeley study proved that librarians were paid substantially less than professionals with comparable educational requirements who were performing jobs traditionally designated as men's work (47).

---

46) California. University. Library Affirmative Action Program for Women Committee. Report on the Status of Women Employed in the Library of the University of California, Berkeley, with Recommendations for Affirmative Action. (Berkeley: 1971).

47) University of California librarians at Berkeley received a salary range adjustment of 5.45% at all steps plus an additional sum distributed from an inequity fund which was approved in the state budget last year. The new scale was effective July 1, 1974 (See Table 4). One argument in their inequity case was the fact that librarians were the lowest paid University of California academic employees. Another argument was sex discrimination, the facts of which may be found in the Report on the Status of Women Employed in the Library of the University of California, Berkeley.

In addition, the Berkeley study showed that there was de facto discrimination within the library against the promotion of women. Despite the fact that well over half the librarians were women, there were few women in top administrative levels at Berkeley. If one views large academic libraries as a whole in the United States, few women have attained the level of Director (48). This pattern exists at Stanford where there is the same imbalance in the top administrative level, which contains one woman and six men. Women outnumber men by about twenty percent, but men hold the higher positions.

A cursory examination of 1973/74 men's and women's salaries in the University Libraries system reveals that women are in fact paid less than men (See Table 8). Both the average and median salaries are lower for women in Librarian III and IV ranks than for men, even though the women have greater average and median years of applicable experience. While the average and median salaries of women closely correlate, those of men show wide variances indicating that more men are paid above the average in Librarian III and IV ranks than are paid below.

In 1970/71, professional women at Stanford were studied in a report on the status of women (49). Inexplicably, though the report aimed at comprehensiveness, librarians were not considered. While the Commission was unable to make an intensive investigation, several ideas and a

---

48) Blankenship, W.C. "Head Librarians: How Many Men? How Many Women?" College and Research Libraries 28 (1967): 41-48.

49) Stanford University. "Affirmative Action at Stanford University; Policies: 1972/73 Report, 1973/74 Priorities." Campus Report, v.6, no.12 (Dec. 5, 1973).

TABLE 8
1973/74 Stanford University Libraries
Librarians' Salaries

	Rank	Salary Average	Salary Median	Years of Applicable Exp. Average	Years of Applicable Exp. Median
MEN	LI	9,000	9,000	2	2
	LII	11,160	10,900	8	8.25
	LIII	12,882	13,000	11	9.25
	LIV	16,737	17,100	27.3	26.5
WOMEN	LI	9,240	9,300	2.7	2.5
	LII	10,868	10,900	8.7	7.75
	LIII	12,483	12,500	14.7	15
	LIV	14,480	14,500	25.1	29

tentative conclusion are worth consideration. Women traditionally have had lower career goals and expectations. Assertive behavior on the part of women has generally neither been encouraged nor accepted. Administrators have tended to overlook the managerial abilities of women and to assume such abilities in their male colleages. Universities are male-dominated institutions. The available data lead us to believe that, for many reasons, women librarians at Stanford are not achieving their full potential, to their own and Stanford libraries' detriment.

RECOMMENDATION 22

The University Affirmative Action Officer, an unbiased source outside the libraries, should be formally requested to review the situation of women in all the Stanford University libraries. The Librarians' Assembly should appoint an ad hoc Committee on Affirmative Action to investigate the status and problems of librarians who are women and/or members of minority groups, and this committee should report its findings and recommendations to the Assembly.

2. COORDINATE LIBRARIES

The coordinate library system at Stanford, while instrumental in developing specialized research collections, primarily exists to distribute budgetary responsibility (50). In a private university where competition for operating funds is intense, the coordinate system allows specialized libraries to concentrate upon sources of funds closest in interest to their specific fields. Although autonomous operation in fund raising, collection development, and service may be desirable, close cooperation among Stanford libraries must be maintained in order to insure the most effective utilization of library and University resources.

The libraries' policies are coordinated in the University Library Council, an administrative panel established by the President of the University. The Council consists of the top administrative officer(s) of each library plus one or two students nominated by the Senate of the Associated Students of Stanford University. It is an advisory group which, according to its charge, "should be expected to maximize opportunities for joint operation and co-operative arrangements that will minimize duplication, competition, overlapping and gaps in collecting and acquisition practices and maximize access to all information resources in the libraries of Stanford University" (51).

---

50) See Appendix VIII for fuller information.

51) Charge to the University Library Council, Stanford, 1972.

The body specifically charged with coordinating collection development is the Acquisition Council, a subgroup of the University Library Council. Its members, librarians primarily responsible for selection, meet quarterly.

There is no official body with responsibility to establish and maintain professional standards for all librarians at Stanford. Since each of the library systems is a separate administrative entity, with the chief administrator reporting directly to a different University officer (See Table 9), it is natural that variations in standards and their application have evolved. There is a need for more coordination in this area, to develop professional standards which are clearly stated and consistently applied among all librarians at Stanford.

There are few service standards which currently apply to all of the Stanford libraries. For example, there are no minimum standards regarding hours of business, availability of professional service, or the kinds of services offered. This lack of standardization can prove frustrating to the library user.

The specialization of the Coordinate Libraries is an asset to the University. However, with the increase of interdisciplinary studies, library patrons and librarians alike frequently must use the resources of more than one library, even during the course of a single project. In order for librarians to provide maximum access to all resources it is important that they have substantial information about the collections and policies of campus libraries other than the one in which they work.

TABLE 9
Administrative Structure of the Libraries at Stanford

- President of the University
  - Director of the Hoover Institution
    - Associate Director in Charge of Library Operations
  - Vice President and Provost
    - Director of University Libraries
    - Dean of the Graduate School of Business
      - Director of the J. Hugh Jackson Library of Business
    - Dean of the School of Law
      - Law Librarian
    - Dean of the School of Medicine
      - Director of the Lane Medical Library
    - Director of SLAC
      - Technical Information Officer
    - Director of the Food Research Institute
      - Librarian

This information has not been available to all librarians in a systematic manner.

One source of such information is printed material. A number of library guides, collection surveys, and bibliographies have been published by Stanford libraries. The Book Selection Policies Manual, issued in 1970 and covering all campus libraries, is an invaluable tool for librarians, whatever their job assignment. Unfortunately the existence of these various guides is often not widely known in all the libraries. The Bulletin of the Stanford University Libraries, a newsletter distributed to all campus libraries, is readily available to all librarians. However its scope is limited almost exclusively to matters of immediate concern to the Stanford University Libraries system, despite efforts by its editorial board to solicit news items from the Coordinate Libraries.

Some information about other Stanford libraries is gained by librarians through informal rather than formal means of communication. Some contacts occur in the course of job duties, especially for librarians involved in collection development or public service. Informal contacts are hampered by the administrative and geographical separation of the Coordinate Libraries.

SULA has as one of its goals increased and enhanced communication among librarians in all the Coordinate Libraries. Its primary emphasis has been on discussion of professional concerns as they directly affect Stanford librarians. To the extent that interested librarians have joined the organization and participated in its activities, it has succeeded in fostering communication. However, membership is voluntary and the group has no real power. Attempts to act as a voice for librarians and to influence library and University decisions regarding them have met with failure. Despite the large amounts of energy expended by dedicated members, this lack of clout has resulted in decreased interest in SULA.

Contact with other librarians and knowledge of other libraries is also facilitated by orientation programs. Although an extensive orientation program has recently been established for librarians in the University Libraries system, most other librarians' overview of Stanford library collections and policies is still dependent on individual imagination and initiative and on the conditions determined by their job assignment.

RECOMMENDATION 23

1. The standards and procedures for appointment, promotion, security of employment, and grievance should be uniformly applied to all librarians at Stanford regardless of their place of assignment. The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment of the Librarians' Assembly should oversee the uniform application of this recommendation.

2. Because of the belief that standards are important in assuring consistency and quality of service among the libraries, the Commission recommends that a committee of the Librarians' Assembly be established (the Committee on Public and Technical Services) to propose minimum standards of service.

3. A formal University interlibrary orientation program, run by the Librarians' Assembly, should be established to enable librarians to learn more about Stanford early in their employment (52).

---

52) See Section IV.B.1.

4. The Librarians' Assembly, to which all librarians would belong, should also further the exchange of information and ideas and encourage all librarians at Stanford to work together toward common goals (53).

---

53) See Section II.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

This report encompasses a broad range of issues, many of which require action beyond the scope of individual library administrations. The Commission recommends the immediate establishment of a Librarians' Assembly, which should then work together with the libraries' administrations in implementing this report's recommendations.

If general agreement among Stanford's librarians exists for the creation of a Librarians' Assembly, then the Director of University Libraries, with the assistance of the University Library Council and SULA, should appoint a committee of five librarians (three from the University Libraries and two from the Coordinate Libraries) to develop the bylaws of the Assembly (to include the size of the Executive Board, the duties of its members and the method of electing its chairperson). In addition, that committee should serve as a nominating committee for the first Executive Board of the Assembly. The committee should hold weekly open meetings during its development of the bylaws, and the agenda should be posted several days in advance of each meeting. Any librarian should be allowed to address the committee on the topic under discussion. As soon as possible, and before December, 1975, there should be a general election by all Stanford librarians on the bylaws and the Executive Board.

One of the first actions of the Librarians' Assembly should be the development of a peer review system with its attendant criteria for promotion and appointment based upon the guidelines provided by this report. The peer review procedure should be operational for the 1976 librarians' evaluation process.

The librarians' classification system should also be revised in accordance with the criteria outlined in the recommendations of Section IV.A.3, and all perquisites and benefits should be granted equally to librarians beyond the probationary stage. In no instance should the perquisites, rank, or salary of a librarian be reduced by any changes made in the classification system. The proposed system is subject to revision and approval by the Librarians' Assembly and subsequent approval and implementation by the University Library Council. In addition, the Librarians' Assembly should be responsible for the continued evaluation and development of the system through a peer review of all appointments and promotions. The Librarians' Assembly should also develop more detailed criteria for promotion.

The Director of University Libraries and the Directors of the Coordinate Libraries, in cooperation with the Academic Council Committee on Libraries and the Librarians' Assembly, should begin the necessary procedures as soon as possible to implement Commission recommendations approved by librarians. The general improvement of the librarians' condition at Stanford will, the Commission believes, increase the effectiveness of the libraries' services.

Finally, the Commission suggests that a progress report should be made in six months to all Stanford librarians on the implementation of its recommendations. This report should be made by the Director of University Libraries in cooperation with the Librarians' Assembly or with the committee appointed to develop its bylaws in the event that the Assembly is not yet operational. This report should be printed in the Library Bulletin in early autumn, 1975, and distributed to all Stanford librarians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, June. "Workload Requirements." In *Goals for UCLA Librarians*, edited by Marcia Endore. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969).

Association of College and Research Libraries. "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians." *College and Research Libraries News*, no.8 (1973): 192-95, and its "Appendixes." *College and Research Libraries News*, no.9 (1973): 243-47.

_____. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians." *College and Research Libraries News*, no.8 (1972): 210-12.

Association of Research Libraries. *Academic Library Statistics, 1972 - 1973*. (Washington, D.C.: 1973).

_____. *ARL Annual Salary Survey, 1969/70 - 1972/73*. (Washington, D.C.: 1970-73).

_____. Office of University and Management Studies. *Status of Librarians Kit*. (Washington, D.C.: 1974). A collection of reports from a variety of libraries.

_____. _____. "Review of Collective Bargaining Actions in Academic and Research Libraries." *ARL Management Supplement*, v.1, no.3 (June 1973).

Auld, Larry and Irene Voit. "Library Group Practice." *College and Research Libraries* 34 (1973): 54-58.

Beach, David N., and Walter R. Mahler. "Management by Objectives." In *The Failure of Success*, edited by Alfred J. Marrow. (New York: Amacom, 1972).

Blake, Fay. "Tenure for UC Librarians." In *Goals for UCLA Librarians*, edited by Marcia Endore. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969).

Blankenship, W.C. "Head Librarians: How Many Men? How Many Women?" *College and Research Libraries* 28 (1967): 41-48.

Bolton, Earl C. "Response of University Library Management to Changing Modes of University Governance and Control." *College and Research Libraries* 33 (1972): 305-11.

Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Organization and Staffing of the Libraries of Columbia University*. (Westport, Conn.: Redgrave Information Resources, 1973).

Borgeson, Earl. *Professional Salary Adjustments - Present Practices, March 19, 1974*. A paper prepared for the Commission on Librarianship at Stanford. See Appendix II.

Branscomb, Lewis C., comp. *The Case for Faculty Status for Academic Librarians*. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1970).

Bundy, Mary Lee. "Decision Making in Libraries." *Illinois Libraries* 43 (1961): 780-93.

_____. and Paul Wasserman. *The College and University Library Administrator; Technical Data Summary: Preliminary Analysis*. (Springfield, Va.: Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, 1970).

California University. *Salary Survey, University of California Libraries*. (Berkeley: 1974).

_____. _____. Library. *Report of the Task Force on Academic Library Personnel*. (Berkeley: 1969).

_____. _____. Library Affirmative Action Program for Women Committee. *Report on the Status of Women Employed in the Library of the University of California, Berkeley, with Recommendations for Affirmative Action*. (Berkeley: 1971).

_____. University at Los Angeles. *The UCLA Library Administrative Network: An Evaluation Study*. (Los Angeles: 1971).

Cameron, Donald F. and Peggy Heim. *Librarians in Higher Education; Their Compensation Structures for the Academic Year 1972-73*. (Washington, D.C.: Council on Library Resources, 1974).

Christ, John M. "The Identity of Educational Librarians." In *Toward a Philosophy of Educational Librarianship*. (Littleton, Col.: Libraries Unlimited, 1972).

Columbia University. Libraries. *The Administrative Organization of the Libraries of Columbia University: A Detailed Description*. (New York: 1973).

_____. _____. *Handbook: Professional Library Staff*. (New York: 1972).

Connecticut. University. "University Senate Faculty Standards Committee Report on the Status of Professional Librarians and Draft Report of the Wilbur Cross Library." In *Status of Librarians Kit*, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

De Fichy, Wendy. "Affirmative Action: Equal Opportunity for Women in Library Management." College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 195-201.

De Gennaro, Richard. "Participative Management or Unionization?" College and Research Libraries 33 (1972): 173-74.

De Priest, Raleigh. "That Inordinate Passion for Status." College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 150-58.

DeProspo, Ernest R. "Management by Objectives: An Approach to Staff Development." In New Directions in Staff Development, edited by E.W.Stone. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

Dickinson, Fidelia. "Participative Management: a Left Fielder's View." California Librarian 34 (1973): 24-33.

Dougherty, Richard M. "The Employment Time Bomb." College and Research Libraries 33 (1972): 357-58.

Downs, Robert B. "Status of University Librarians, 1964." College and Research Libraries 25 (1964): 253-58.

Duke University. Library. "Ranking Structure for Duke University Librarians and Committee on Appointment and Promotion Policy." In Status of Librarians Kit, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

Endore, Marcia, comp. Goals for UCLA Librarians. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969). Papers presented at a Conference held on February 1, 1969, under the sponsorship of the UCLA Librarians Association.

_____. "Staff Composition." In Goals for UCLA Librarians, edited by Marcia Endore. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969).

Ferguson, Douglas. Collegiality and University Librarians. A paper prepared for the Commission on Librarianship at Stanford (Stanford: 1974).

Flanagan, Leo N. "Professionalism Dismissed?" College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 209-14.

Flener, Jane G. "Staff Participation in Management in Large University Libraries." College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 275-79.

Florida. University. Libraries. Committee on Performance Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure. "Report." In Status of Librarians Kit, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

Friedgood, Eleanore. "What Happens to the Incumbent Professional Librarian When Faculty Status is Achieved?" In *Goals for UCLA Librarians*, edited by Marcia Endore. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969).

Galloway, Louise. "Academic Librarians Participate in the Selection of a Director of Libraries." *College and Research Libraries* 33 (1972): 220-27.

Garrison, Dee. "The Tender Technicians: the Feminization of Public Librarianship, 1876-1905." *Journal of Social History* 6 (1972/73): 131-59.

Goldstein, Melvin S. *Collective Bargaining in the Field of Librarianship*. (New York: 1969).

Goodman, Charles H. "Incentives and Motivation for Staff Development." In *New Directions in Staff Development*, edited by E.W.Stone. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

Grove, Pearce S. "Library Governance: Changes Coming." *Texas Libraries* 32 (1970): 206-12.

Gwinup, Thomas. "The Failure of Librarians to Attain Profession: the Causes, the Consequences, and the Prospect." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 48 (1974): 482-90.

Haas, Warren J. "Management in Research Libraries: Implications for Library Education." *Library Quarterly* 43 (1973): 369-84.

Hansen, Ralph W. "Stanford University Library: Genesis, 1891-1906." *Journal of Library History* 9 (1974): 138-58.

Haro, Robert P. "Change in Academic Libraries." *College and Research Libraries* 33 (1972): 97-103.

_____. "Collective Action and Professional Negotiation: Factors and Trends in Academic Libraries." *ALA Bulletin* 63 (1969): 993-96.

Hawaii. University. Library. *Library Personnel Committee Policies and Procedures*. (Honolulu: 1972).

Henselman, Frances. "What's Being Done?" In *New Directions in Staff Development*, edited by E.W.Stone. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

Hintz, Carl. "Criteria for Appointment to and Promotion in Academic Rank." *College and Research Libraries* 29 (1968): 341-46.

Holley, Edward G. "Organization and Administration of Urban University Libraries." College and Research Libraries 33 (1972): 175-89.

_____. "Who Runs Libraries? The Emergence of Library Governance in Higher Education." Wilson Library Bulletin 47 (1973): 42-50.

Huling, Nancy. "Faculty Status: a Comprehensive Bibliography." College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 440-62.

Hyman, Ruth and Gail Schlacter. "Academic Status: Who Wants It?" College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 472-77.

Illinois. University at Urbana-Champaign. Library. Statement of Goals and Objectives. (Champaign: 1972).

Indiana. University at Bloomington. Library. Papers Delivered at the Indiana University Library Dedication, Oct.9-10, 1970. (Bloomington: 1970).

Johnson, Marjorie. "Performance Appraisal of Librarians: a Survey." College and Research Libraries 33 (1972): 359-67.

Johnson, Peter A. Career Status and Tenure. A paper prepared for the Commission on Librarianship at Stanford. (Stanford: 1974).

"Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians." College and Research Libraries News, no.8 (1972): 209-10.

Jones, Harold D. "LACUNY: A Library Association in Action." California Librarian 29 (1968): 204-209.

Kaplan, Louis. "Participation: Some Basic Considerations on the Theme of Academe." College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 235-41.

Kaser, David W. "Making the Effort." In New Directions in Staff Development, edited by E.W.Stone. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

_____. "Staff Role in Goal Determination." In Papers Delivered at the Indiana University Library Dedication, Oct.9-10,1970. (Bloomington: 1970).

Kaye, Edwin. "Peer Evaluation of Librarians." In Goals for UCLA Librarians, edited by Marcia Endore. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969).

Kudryk, Oleg. The Role of the Librarian in the University. (n.p.,n.d.).

Lahti, Robert E. Innovative College Management. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973).

Lundy, Frank A. "Faculty Rank of Professional Librarians." *College and Research Libraries* 12 (1951): 11-19 & 109-22.

Lyman, Richard W. "New Trends in Higher Education: the Impact on the University Library." *College and Research Libraries* 33 (1972): 298-304.

Lynch, Beverly P. "The Academic Library and Its Environment." *College and Research Libraries* 35 (1974): 126-32.

_____. "Participative Management in Relation to Library Effectiveness." *College and Research Libraries* 33 (1972): 387-97.

McAnally, Arthur M. "The Dynamics of Securing Academic Status." *College and Research Libraries* 18 (1957): 386-95.

_____. "Privileges and Obligations of Academic Status." *College and Research Libraries* 24 (1963): 102-108.

_____. "Status of the University Librarian in the Academic Community." In *Research Librarianship*, edited by Jerrold Orne. (New York: R.R.Bowker, 1971).

_____. and Robert B. Downs. "The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries." *College and Research Libraries* 34 (1973): 103-23.

McKann, Michael R. "Flextime at Florida." *Library Journal* 73 (1973): 3231-34.

Makovics, Lesley. "Flexible Scheduling at Jackson Library." *Library Bulletin of the Stanford University Libraries*, v.26, no.20 (June 17, 1974): 81-82.

Marchant, Maurice P. "Participative Management as Related to Personnel Development." *Library Trends* 20 (1971): 48-59.

_____. "Participative Management in Libraries." In *New Directions in Staff Development*, edited by E.W.Stone. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

Martell, Charles. "Administration: Which Way - Traditional Practice or Modern Theory?" *College and Research Libraries* 33 (1972): 104-12.

Melinat, Carl H., comp. *Educational Media in Libraries*. (Syracuse, N.Y.: School of Library Science, Syracuse University, 1963).

Meyer, Ursula. "Planning for a Statewide Continuing Professional Education Program." In *New Directions in Staff Development*, edited by E.W.Stone. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

Michigan. State University. "Bylaws of the Library Faculty." In *Status of Librarians Kit*, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

Minnesota. University. University Libraries, Twin Cities Campus. Constitution. (Minneapolis: 1972).

Moffett, W.A. "The Academic Job Crisis: a Unique Opportunity or Business as Usual?" College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 191-94.

Moore, Jean. "Notes for Discussion of Academic Senate Membership and Faculty Rank for UCLA Professional Librarians." In Goals for UCLA Librarians, edited by Marcia Endore. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969).

Moriarty, John H. "Academic Library Management: Traditional." In Papers Delivered at the Indiana University Library Dedication, Oct.9-10,1970. (Bloomington: 1970).

Nebraska. University at Lincoln. "Minimum Requirements for Promotion in Rank." In Status of Librarians Kit, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

Nelson, Jerold. "Suavity and Sacrifice: Steps to Improved Communication with the Faculty in the Academic Library." California Librarian 34 (1973): 34-44.

New York. State University at Buffalo. "Bylaws of the University Libraries." In Status of Librarians Kit, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

Oklahoma. University. Rules of the University of Oklahoma Libraries Faculty. Revised 30 June 1972.

Oregon. University. Library Faculty Handbook on Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation Procedures. 1st ed. 1970.

Peele, David. "Evaluating Library Employees." Library Journal 97 (1972): 2803-2807.

Phipps, Barbara H. "Library Instruction for the Undergraduate." College and Research Libraries 29 (1968): 411-23.

Plate, Kenneth H. and Elizabeth W. Stone. "Factors Affecting Librarians' Job Satisfaction: A Report of Two Studies." Library Quarterly 44 (1974): 97-110.

Princeton University. Rules and Procedures of the Professional Library Staff. (Princeton: 1968).

Purdue University. "Constitution of the Faculty of the Libraries and Audio Visual Center." In Status of Librarians Kit, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

Rosenthal, Joseph A. "Nonprofessionals and Cataloging: a Survey of Five Libraries." Library Resources & Technical Services 13 (1969): 321-31.

Rudolph, G.A., comp. *The Academic Community Looks at Library Management*. (Blacksburg, Va.: Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1972).

Saint Louis University. "Faculty Employment Agreement for Univeristy Library Professional Staff." In *Status of Librarians Kit*, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

Scherer, Henry Howard. *Faculty-Librarian Relationships in Selected Liberal Arts Colleges*. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1960.

Schiller, Anita R.; James W.Grimm; and Margo C.Trumpeter. *Characteristics of Professional Personnel in College and University Libraries*. (Springfield, Ill.: Illinois State Library, 1969).

Schlachter, Gail. "Quasi-Unions and Organizational Hegemony Within the Library Field." *Library Quarterly* 43 (1973): 185-98.

Shout, Howard F. "On-the-Job Staff Development at the Detroit Edison Company." In *New Directions in Staff Development*, edited by E.W.Stone. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

Slocum, Grace P. "Participation by Committee." In *New Directions in Staff Development*, edited by E.W.Stone. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

Smith, Eldred. "Do Libraries Need Managers?" *Library Journal* 94 (1969): 502-506.

_____. "Librarians' Organizations as Change Agents." *Focus on Indiana Libraries* 24 (1970): 178-81.

_____. "Service and Housekeeping: Changing Professional and Nonprofessional Responsibilities in the Academic Research Library." In *Papers Delivered at the Indiana University Library Dedication, Oct.9-10,1970*. (Bloomington: 1970).

Stanford University. "Affirmative Action at Stanford University; Policies: 1972/73 Report; 1973/74 Priorities." *Campus Report*, v.6, no.12 (Dec. 5, 1973).

_____. "Exempt Staff Raises to be Based on Merit." *Campus Report*, v.6, no.42 (Aug. 7, 1974).

_____. *Guide: Administrative Organization, Policies and Procedures*. (Stanford: 1969+). Loose-leaf; updated irregularly.

_____. Committee on the Professoriate at Stanford. *Report*. (Stanford: 1974)

_____. Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. *Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace*. (Stanford: 1963)

Stanford University. Personnel and Employee Relations Department. *Job Classification and Pay Plan*. (Stanford: 1971+).

_____. President. *Annual Report*. (Stanford: 1901-).

_____. University Libraries. *Annual Report of the Director*. (Stanford: 1923-).

_____. _____. *Intellectual Freedom and the Stanford University Libraries*. (Stanford: 1972).

_____. _____. *Library Administrative Regulations*. (Stanford: 1968+) Loose-leaf; updated irregularly.

_____. _____. *Summary of Salary Rates Paid to Professional Staff, 1972/73 - 1974/75*. (Stanford: 1972-74).

_____. _____. *University Librarian's Annual Report*. (Stanford: 1901-23)

Stanford University Librarians Association. *Constitution*. (Stanford: 1969)

_____. *Draft Report on Nomenclature*. (Stanford: 1971).

_____. *Security of Employment: Draft*. (Stanford: 1971).

Stone, Elizabeth W., comp. *New Directions in Staff Development; Moving from Ideas to Action*. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

Syracuse University. "Bylaws of the Faculty of the Libraries." In *Status of Librarians Kit*, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

Tallau, Adeline and Benjamin R.Beede. "Faculty Status and Library Governance." *Library Journal* 99 (1974): 1521-23.

Tallman, Johanna E. "Salary Position Paper." In *Goals for UCLA Librarians*, edited by Marcia Endore. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969).

Thompson, James. "University Library Staff." In *An Introduction to University Library Administration*. (London: Archon Books, 1970).

Thornbury, John. "Sabbatical and Other Leaves, and Access to Grants, Fellowships, and Research Funds" In *Goals for UCLA Librarians*, edited by Marcia Endore. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969).

University of Cincinnati. "Bylaws of the Library Faculty. In *Status of Librarians Kit*, compiled by the Association of Research Libraries. (Washington, D.C.: 1974).

University of Pittsburgh. Libraries. Faculty Status to Professional Librarians: a Final Draft Proposal for Implementation of the University Senate Faculty Status Document. (Pittsburgh: 1971).

Vagianos, Louis. "The Librarian and the Garbageman: Professionalism Reconsidered." Library Journal 98 (1973): 391-93.

Vinnes, Norman. "The Four-day Week." Library Journal 73 (1973): 1550-52.

Volkersz, Evert. "Grievance, Appeal, and Review Procedures." In Goals for UCLA Librarians, edited by Marcia Endore. (Los Angeles: Librarians Association, University of California, 1969).

Waldhart, Thomas J. and Leroy G.Zweifel. "Organizational Patterns of Scientific and Technical Libraries: an Examination of Three Issues." College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 426-35.

Weber, David C. "An Approach to the Academic Status of Librarians." California Librarian 29 (1968): 133-41.

_____. Letter to Colin Pittendrigh, Aug. 17, 1973.

_____. "Place of Professional-Specialists on the University Library Staff." College and Research Libraries 26 (1965): 383-88.

Wilder, David. "Management Attitudes: Team Relationships." Library Journal 94 (1969): 498-502.

Williams, Edwin E. "Harvard's Study Committee on Professional Library Personnel." Harvard Library Bulletin 21 (1973): 277-319.

Wilson, Louis R. and Raynard C. Swank. Report of a Survey of the Library of Stanford University for Stanford University, November 1946-March 1947. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1947).

Yen-Ran Yeh, Thomas. "Library Peer Evaluation for Promotion and Merit Increase: How It Works." College and Research Libraries 34 (1973): 270-74.

VIII. APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

CHARGE TO THE
COMMISSION ON LIBRARIANSHIP
AT STANFORD

May 22, 1972

After reviewing developments regarding the status of librarians during the last few years and with the specific encouragement of the Stanford University Librarians Association and the University Library Council, the Director of the University Libraries is creating a Commission on Librarianship at Stanford to examine the role and status of librarians at the University, including:

professional relationships within the University,
means of facilitating the effective use of librarians,
suitable recognition of the services of librarians to the community,
aspects of appointment, promotion and perquisites,
involvement of librarians in formal and informal teaching, and other aspects of their working environment.

There will also be raised the question of the most effective forum or organization through which librarians can, as individuals and as a university professional group, share in concern for and contribution to higher education, research, and institutional governance and development.

The report on librarianship at Stanford and the recommendations leading to a properly effective professional stature, should be a landmark document at Stanford. In general, it should deal with the following matters:

1) A "statement of need" which treats of two basic issues:
   (a) the recognition of librarians as professionals engaged as partners in the educational program and objectives of the University, and
   (b) a means of facilitating suitable librarian participation in University academic and administrative concerns.
2) The identification and analysis of various employment relationships that give meaning to the status of an individual librarian - position classification, compensation, research leaves, working titles, job security, and employment benefits.
3) An analysis of the various collective relationships or organizational units that might be formed to give meaning to librarianship within the university environment - professional status, committee membership, a library assembly, a librarians association, or a library department.
4) A set of conclusions and a comprehensive list of recommendations for action that will achieve a suitable working environment for

librarians, with procedures for implementing the recommendations clearly specified.

The Commission will be composed of twelve persons and may be divided into task forces for the several inquiries. For special assistance they will be able, with the approval and assistance of the Associate Director of Libraries, to co-opt other individuals within Stanford librarianship or in other professional positions in the university. As a general rule the Commission members may expect to spend from one to two hours a week of their own time to meet of work on the assignment. Brief absences from the Commission are to be expected; absences of longer nature, due to a variety of causes, will result in the Director's appointment to the Commission of an alternate member.

Only the over-all time frame can be presented at this time. Hopefully the Commission will complete its task within twelve to fourteen months. Formal action by librarians will precede the presentation of the report to the University administration; implementation should occur as soon as possible thereafter.

Persons who have agreed to serve on the Commission are the following:
Mr. Garrett H. Bowles, Chairman - Librarian III, Catalog Department
Miss Judith A. Moomaw, Vice-Chairman - Librarian III, Catalog Department
Mr. Robert H. Breyfogle, Librarian II, Catalog Department
Mrs. Sandra K. Korn, Librarian III, Government Document Department
Miss Janice M. Lane, Librarian I, Meyer Memorial Library (Reference)
Miss Coralia Serafim, Librarian II, Hoover Institution (Reference)
Miss April D. Stenzel, Librarian II, Law Library (Catalog Department)
Miss Carol Turner, Librarian II, Reference Department
Mr. William P. Allan, Librarian III, Reference Department
Miss Jean L. Finch, Librarian III, Art and Architecture Library
Mr. Frederick C. Lynden, Librarian III, Acquisition Department
Mr. Jack Plotkin, Librarian IV, Central Circulation and Reference Department

APPENDIX II

PROFESSIONAL SALARY ADJUSTMENTS - PRESENT PRACTICES, MARCH 19, 1974, by Earl Borgeson, Associate Director, Stanford University Libraries.

1. The amount of money for salary adjustments for professional staff is part of the salary budget request of the Personnel & Employee Relations Department presented to the Board of Trustees. The Director of Libraries can and does provide the Provost and P & ER with comparative salary data and other justifications for use in such budget presentations. This data includes salary information from ALA, ARL, Seven University Group, the University of California, Berkeley and Los Angeles, the California State Universities, and others as available.

2. When the Board of Trustees acts upon the recommendations made and authorizes a percentage for the improvement of the various salary bases, the P & ER Department and the Director's Office verify the current budget base, apply the approved percentage and arrive at the number of dollars to be available for professional salary adjustments. Actually, the procedure is not quite that simple, but this will suffice as a description of the general routine.

3. Library supervisors and staff members prepare, and Department Chiefs review the performance appraisal form for each staff member. Department Chiefs and Assistant Directors review only the appraisals of those persons working in their respective units.

   Directors also review the files along with all documents a staff member might have placed in their individual files (notice of publications, reports of trips, attendance at meetings, commendations, courses completed, and so on). Factors are noted that indicate any variation in what might be characterized as an individual's normal satisfactory job performance and professional growth.

4. At the same time, each Department Chief is asked to recommend a current performance rating for each staff member as satisfactory, more than, or less than satisfactory. They are also asked at this time to recommend (a) change of status because of changes in job assignment or (b) change of status because of marked professional growth.

5. A preliminary calculation of adjustments in terms of percentage values assigned to the various factors noted above, is made by the Associate Director and the Director. The total of those adjustments is tested against the amount of money available for salary improvement.

6. Each Assistant Director and Department Chief is then asked to review the tentative increments; discussions are held to bring all factors to bear on the decision; a consensus is reached; and the total of all individual increments must be made to equal the funds available for increases. Ordinarily, then, three to five persons share in this determination of a salary adjustment for any one staff member.

7. When that final set of figures has been determined, the recommendations are reviewed with the Provost's Office for agreement with University policy and salary adjustment guidelines.

8. When the recommendations are thus verified, approved in writing and submitted to accounting, the preparation process ends, except for dispatch of individual notices by the Director's Office. These too, are routed through the Assistant Directors and Department Chiefs for a final accuracy check before delivery to each individual. To the extent that explanations are needed, the Department Chiefs are now fully informed so that they can provide answers. Questions can, and do, come to the Director's Office, of course.

9. The timing of this process is governed by the date the Trustees approve the budget and the schedules of P & ER and the Provost's Office for their data preparation and reviews. Library routines move along independently, but until all of these procedures are completed throughout the University, individual library staff notices cannot be distributed.

APPENDIX III

STANFORD LIBRARIANS' QUESTIONNAIRE
November 10, 1972

NOTE: Percentages are given in terms of the 109 returns and may not equal 100% because of multiple responses or no response to a question.

1. Do you work in the University Libraries? 68 (63%)
   Or a Coordinate Library? 40 (36%)
   Other: 1 (1%)

2. Rank: Librarian I - 8 (7%)
   Librarian II - 39 (36%)
   Librarian III - 28 (26%)
   Librarian IV - 13 (12%)
   Other - 20 (19%)

3. Type of position: public services - 41 (38%)
   technical services - 46 (43%)
   other - 20 (19%)

4. Age: under 25 - 3 (3%)
   25-35 - 29 (27%)
   35-45 - 26 (24%)
   45-55 - 24 (22%)
   55-65 - 22 (20%)
   over 65 - 4 (4%)

5. Sex: male - 50 (46%)
   female - 59 (54%)

6. Academic degree held (please check all held):
   BA/BS - 95 (88%)
   MA/MS - 42 (39%)
   Ph.D. - 9 (8%)
   MLS or equivalent in librarianship - 86 (80%)
   Other - 10 (9%)

7. Language abilities (languages read or spoken):
   French - 78 (72%)
   German - 53 (49%)
   Italian - 24 (22%)
   Russian - 17 (15%)
   Spanish - 38 (35%)
   None - 19 (17%)

8. Are you presently working on an advanced degree?
   Yes - 8 (7%)
   No - 101 (93%)

9. Have you taken Stanford courses while working in the Stanford libraries?
   Credit - 10 (9%)
   Audit - 40 (37%)
   No - 51 (47%)

10. Have you participated in library or other work-related workshops, conferences, etc.?
   Yes - 87 (81%)
   No - 23 (21%)

11. Have you taken other courses, training, etc.?
   Credit - 25 (23%)
   Audit - 20 (19%)
   No - 35 (32%)

12. How many years have you worked as a professional librarian at Stanford? - Not tabulable

13. Number of years as a professional librarian in other libraries: None; University and research; College; Jr. College; Public; Special; Other. - Not tabulable

14. Number of years of work experience before becoming a professional librarian. Type of work. - Not tabulable

15. Are you currently employed elsewhere? Yes - 13 (12%); No - 97 (90%)
   Librarian?; Teacher?; Other? - Not tabulable
   Reason: Not tabulable

16. Library related activities (last 5 years):
   Courses taught - 24 (22%)
   Publications - 40 (37%)
   Consulting - 27 (25%)

17. Non-library related activities (last 5 years):
   Courses taught - 11 (10%)
   Publications - 14 (13%)
   Consulting - 27 (25%)

18. Association membership (please specify)	Officer	Comm. member
American Library Association - 26 (24%)	3 (3%)	8 (7%)
California Library Association - 29 (27%)		6 (6%)
Special Library Association - 24 (22%)		5 (5%)
Other library associations - Not tabulated		
Amer. Assn. of Univ. Profs. - 7 (6%)		1 (1%)
Other scholarly or professional associations - Not tabulated		

19. What were the main things that brought you to Stanford?
    - The job: 53
    - The area: 45
    - Status of Stanford University: 12
    - Advancement opportunities: 8
    - Spouse: 7

20. Does your own education and work experience match well with your current job? Yes - 90 (83%); No - 13 (12%)

21. Are you interested in Stanford's offering opportunities to increase your professional competence?
    - On-the-job training: Yes - 68 (63%); No - 31 (29%)
    - Short courses or workshops offered by the library: Yes - 75 (69%); No - 26 (24%)
    - Credit courses or institutes offered by Stanford or other institutions: Yes 72 (67%); No - 22 (20%)
    - Work experience in other departments of the Stanford libraries: Yes - 54 (50%); No - 45 (42%)

22. Do you feel that Stanford offers adequate opportunities for professional development? Yes - 47 (44%); No - 55 (51%)

23. Do you feel that Stanford offers adequate encouragement for professional development? Yes - 43 (40%); No - 60 (56%)

24. Do you feel that the libraries at Stanford discriminate in terms of salary against:
    - women? 32 (30%)
    - minorities? 10 (9%)
    - other? 10 (9%)

25. Do you feel that the libraries at Stanford discriminate in terms of promotion against:
    - women? 42 (39%)
    - minorities? 12 (11%)
    - other? 11 (10%)

26. Do you desire to advance to a higher rank in the Stanford Libraries?
    - Yes - 76 (70%)
    - No - 38 (35%)

27. Do you feel you have been underclassified?
    - Yes - 26 (24%)
    - No - 77 (71%)

28. Do you feel it is possible to advance to a higher rank in your current position?
    - Yes - 38 (35%)
    - No - 63 (58%)
        - Need more education/training - 11 (10%)
        - Must become an administrator - 24 (22%)
        - Must transfer to another department - 11 (10%)
        - Other - 14 (13%)

29. Are you satisfied with the scope of your job?
    Yes - 72 (67%)
    No - 34 (31%)
    If not, would you prefer your job to be:
    broader in scope (e.g., offer elements of both technical and public services)? - 20 (19%)
    narrower in scope (e.g., allow you to concentrate on areas in which you are most competent)? - 12 (11%)

30. Does your position require your doing an unreasonable amount of clerical work?
    Yes - 75 (69%)
    No - 23 (21%)
    If yes, could this work be redistributed with the current staff?
    Yes - 8 (7%)
    No - 13 (12%)

31. Do you participate in decisions that affect your job?
    Yes - 81 (75%)
    No - 27 (25%)

32. Do your physical surroundings and facilities contribute to the efficient performance of your work?
    Yes - 37 (34%)
    No - 69 (64%)

33. Do you feel that lines of communication need improvement:
    between you and your library administration?
    Yes - 60 (56%); No - 36 (33%)
    between you and your department head? Yes - 27 (25%); No - 62 (57%)
    between you and your staff? Yes - 18 (17%); No - 67 (62%)
    between you and your colleagues? Yes - 32 (30%); No - 65 (60%)
    between the Main Library and other Stanford libraries?
    Yes - 34 (31%); No - 28 (26%)

34. Do you feel that means of communication (memos, grapevine, etc.) are adequate:
    between you and your library administration?
    Yes - 38 (35%); No - 58 (54%)
    between you and your department head? Yes - 67 (62%); No - 26 (24%)
    between you and your staff? Yes - 71 (66%); No - 15 (14%)
    between you and your colleagues? Yes - 69 (64%); No - 24 (22%)
    between the Main Library and other Stanford libraries?
    Yes - 34 (31%); No - 49 (45%)

35. Do you feel that the library functions as a major force in the intellectual life of the community? Yes - 60 (56%); No - 40 (37%)

36. Do you think the campus community is adequately aware of the resources and services offered by the libraries?
    Yes - 21 (20%); No - 72 (67%)

37. Which services offered by the library should be strengthened?

Answers (examples)	No. of replies
Reference services	18
Better catalog	11
Serial records	8
Classes in bibliography	6
Dissemination of information about the library	5

38. Do you feel the libraries have a proper balance between technical services and public services? Yes - 38 (35%); No - 32 (30%)

39. Do librarians have a teaching function?
Yes - 83 (77%); No - 18 (17%)

40. Do you feel that the status of librarians at Stanford is adequate?
Yes - 32 (30%); No - 61 (56%)

41. Do you feel that the salary of librarians at Stanford is adequate?
Yes - 29 (27%); No - 71 (66%)

42. Do you feel that benefits granted to Stanford librarians are adequate? Yes - 56 (52%); No - 47 (44%)

43. Do you think that faculty status would improve the lot of librarians? Yes 60 (56%); No - 44 (41%)

44. Do you think librarians at Stanford should seek faculty status?
Yes - 45 (42 %); No - 52 (48%)

45. Are you interested in taking advantage of library released time to
work toward an advanced degree? 35 (32%)
engage in research and publication? 53 (49%)
serve on University committees? 42 (39%)
teach? 31 (29%)

46. Do you feel that unionization would improve the lot of librarians?
Yes 27 (25%); No - 69 (63%); Maybe - 2 (2%)

47. Rank each of the following on a scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low) priority as areas in which improvements could be made for Stanford librarians:
1 higher salaries
2 time off/funds for study, research, and publication (e.g., sabbatical leave)
3 flexible time schedule
4 time off/funds for participation in professional activities
5 insurance (health, dental, etc.)
6 faculty privileges (parking, on-campus housing, etc.)
7 job security
8 nine-month appointment
9 retirement benefits
10 different evaluation system
11 membership in academic council, academic committees

APPENDIX IV

LIBRARIANS' STATUS QUESTIONNAIRE
September 8, 1972

The results of the questionnaire sent to selected academic libraries follow the coded list of respondants arranged by collection size.*

1. Harvard University
2. Yale University
3. University of Illinois
4. Columbia University
5. University of California, Berkeley
6. Cornell University
7. Stanford University
8. Indiana University
9. University of Minnesota
10. Princeton University
11. Northwestern University
12. New York University
13. Michigan State University
14. University of North Carolina
15. University of Pittsburgh
16. University of Kansas
17. Pennsylvania State University
18. University of Florida
19. University of Oklahoma
20. University of Massachusetts
21. University of Oregon
22. University of Hawaii (non-ARL member)

1. How many hours a week are the librarians required to work?

unspecified = 6, 18, 19
35 = 1, 4, 12
36.25 = 10
37.5 = 2, 8, 11, 15, 20
39 = 3, 14
40 = 5, 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 21, 22

2. Do librarians work less than a twelve-month year?

no = all respondants

---

* Association of Research Libraries. Academic Library Statistics, 1972/73. (Washington: 1973).

3. How many breaks are allowed per day?
open = 4, 17, 18, 21
2 (20 min. ea.) = 19
2 (15 min. ea.) = all others
2 (10 min. ea.) = 22

4. How many vacation days per year for librarians?
30 days = 1, 12, 14, 19
26 days = 2
24 days = 5, 16, 17
23 days = 3, 4, 11, 15, 21
22 days = 6, 8-10, 13, 18, 20
21 days = 22
20 days = 7
How many days of vacation can a librarian cumulate?
open = 1, 9
90 = 22
2 years = 5-7, 18, 20
30 = 11, 17
permission = 3
none = 2, 8, 10, 12-16, 19, 21

5. How many days sick leave per year for librarians?
open = 1, 4, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, 21
30 = 19
21 = 22
20 = 2
15 = 3, 20
14 = 14
12 = 5, 6, 8, 12, 15
11 = 7
6 = 18
12 for 1st year then 1 month = 11
How many days of sick leave can a librarian cumulate?
no limit = 5, 7, 12, 14, 20, 22
6 months = 3, 13
69 = 6
60 = 8
30 = 10, 11, 19

6. Are librarians paid
weekly = 20
semi-monthly = 6, 7, 9, 18, 22
monthly = all others

7. Are librarians allowed to take classes (or work toward an advanced degree) on library time?
   no = 2, 8, 9, 14
   yes = all others

   If yes, does the library pay the tuition or fee?
   waived or 100% = 3, 6, 12, 20, 22
   1 class/quarter = 18
   depends on class = 1
   partly = 8
   75% = 17
   50% = 5, 19
   no = 2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 21

8. Are the librarians eligible to receive travel expenses for participation in professional organizations, workshops, etc.?
   partial = 8
   yes = all others

9. Are the following kinds of insurance available to librarians?
   unemployment = all except 3, 14, 18, 19
   life = all
   dental = 3, 22
   disability = all except 2-4, 6, 18
   medical = all

   How much does the employer contribute?
   $300.00/year = 13
   $197.28/year = 7
   $192.00/year = 5
   $144.00/year = 15
   $125.00/year = 16
   $120.00/year = 14, 21
   $119.76/year = 18
   $60.00/year = 22
   100% = 3, 9(1 person), 10 (Major Medical), 17
   75% = 20
   60% = 2 (Yale Plan, 35% to Blue Cross)
   50% = 1

10. Which of the following retirement plans are available to librarians?
Social Security = all except 3, 5, 20
TIAA/CREF = 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10-15, 19, 21
state employees = 3, 6, 14, 16-22
private = 5, 6, 9
How much does the employer contribute?
variable = 14, 15, 21
100.0% = 6 (private plan)
75.0% = 10
15.0% = 12
12.5% = 1
12.0% = 6 (state)
10.0% = 2, 6 (TIAA/CREF), 11, 13
8.36% = 5
7.8% = 22
6.25% = 18
6.0% = 16
5.5% = 17
3.5% = 9 (to $5,000, 14% above $5,000)
3.0% = 19 (TIAA/CREF)

11. At what age is the librarian required to start paying toward retirement?
not required = 1, 2, 8, 15
30 years old = 10, 11
35 years old = 4, 7, 13
employed:
beginning = 5, 9, 12, 14, 17-20, 22
6 months = 21
1 year = 16
3 years = 3, 6

12. Is there a tax-free annuity plan available for librarians?
no = 1, 8, 11, 12, 14-16
yes = all others

13. Do librarians have faculty status?
yes = 3, 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 22
no = all others

14. Can librarians join the faculty club?
none = 22
yes = all others (7: LIII and above only)

15. Are librarians eligible for membership in the academic senate?
yes = 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15-22
some = 1
no = all others

16. Do librarians have faculty parking privileges?
none = 12
no = 5
LIII and above = 7
no response = 2
yes = all others

17. Is parking free on campus?
yes = 7, 10, 17
no = all others
If no, how much is the fee?
$5.00 - $300.00

18. Are librarians eligible for sabbatical leave?
no = 1, 2, 5, 7, 11, 14, 18
yes = all others

19. Do librarians have tenure?
yes = 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16-19, 21, 22
no = all others

20. Are librarians organized into a local professional organization other than social?
yes = 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15, 19, 22
no = 1, 4, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16-18, 20

21. Is there a union librarians may join?
yes = 5, 8, 9
no = all others

22. How are your librarians ranked and what is the salary range for each rank? (X indicates rank used, but no salary range provided.)

	U.of Illinois	U.of Minn.	U.of N.C.
Instructor	8,500+	11,568+	X
Assistant Professor	11,000+	12,710+	X
Associate Professor	13,450+	no min/max	X
Professor	17,100	" " "	X

	U.of Kansas	U.of Oklahoma	U.of Oregon
Instructor	7,900 min.	8,500-9,500	8,916-10,584
Senior Instructor			9,644-10,642
Assistant Professor	X	8,500-18,500	11,208-13,420
Associate Professor	X	10,100-15,800	13,680-14,752
Professor		22,200-24,000	17,400-19,405

	Harvard	Stanford	Princeton	Northwestern
Librarian I	X	8,600-9,000	8,400+	9,000-9,500
Librarian II	X	9,700-11,300	9,200+	9,400-10,800
Librarian III	X	10,900-15,800	10,400+	10,300-13,060
Librarian IV		13,900-20,000		11,200-17,500

	Yale	U.of Pitt.	U.of Mass.
Librarian I	8,500+	8,000+	8,800-11,700
Librarian II	9,000+	9,500+	9,900-13,600
Librarian III	10,000+	11,000+	11,500-16,200
Librarian IV	12,000+	13,000+	14,100+
Librarian V	14,000+	15,000+	17,200+

	U.of Cal.	U.of Florida	U.of Indiana
Assistant Librarian	8,280-11,652	8,150-11,200	X
Associate Librarian	10,824-15,204	9,200-13,700	X
Librarian	14,496-18,396	12,900-19,700	X

	Columbia	Cornell	Pa.State
Junior Librarian	9,000+		
Assistant Librarian	X	8,400-10,226	9,216-13,680
Sr.Asst.Librarian		9,000-12,300	10,584-17,280
Associate Librarian	X	10,000-15,487	14,544-22,536
Librarian	X	12,000-18,000	16,272-18,432
Senior Librarian	X		

	U.of Hawaii
Assistant in ___	6,756-8,868
Junior Specialist	8,868-11,676
Assistant Specialist	11,232-14,772
Associate Specialist	14,772-19,428
Specialist	19,428-25,572

	New York University
Library Associate	9,500+
Assistant Curator	X
Associate Curator	X
Curator	X

	Michigan State U.
Librarian	9,000-15,000
Division Librarian	12,800-19,400

23. Are librarians promoted by peer review?
yes = 5, 6, 9, 12, 15, 17-19, 22
no = 1-3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 20

APPENDIX V

PEER REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE
January 23, 1973

Responses from six selected libraries:
- Michigan State University
- State University of New York, Buffalo
- University of California, Berkeley
- Universiy of Hawaii
- University of Oklahoma
- Universty of Oregon

1. How long has peer evaluation been practiced in your library?
   one year = 1 three years = 1 four years = 4

2. Is there a committee of peers who review all of the evaluations?
   yes = 5; More than one committee = 3

3. How large is the committee?
   three = 1 five = 3 six = 1 twelve = 1

4. How is the committee chosen?
   appointed = 1 elected = 3 both = 2

5. How long do the members of the committee serve?
   one year = 2 two years = 1 three years = 2

6. Are all members of the committee professionals?
   yes = 6

7. Is the membership of the committee secret or known?
   secret = 1 known = 5

8. Does the committee review all evaluations or only those for which promotion or tenure is being considered?
   all = 3 other = 3

9. Is the committee's role that of a decision making authority or more of a recommender and consultative body?
   recommender or advisory = 6

10. Does the head of the library have a veto power over the committee's recommendations?
    yes = 4 no = 2

11. Based on your experience, what do you feel are the advantages and disadvantages of your system?

Advantages: additional input, creates good morale, staff involvement, broader base, parity, fairness, stimulates professional participation, leash on administration, thorough review of each case.

Disadvantages: time consuming, equal pay rather than merit.

12. Is your system for the library closely related to or patterned after the university's system for evaluating faculty?
yes = 4 no = 1

13. What has been the general response of librarians evaluated under this system?
favorable = 6

14. After working with a peer evaluation system, would you recommend it over a traditional hierarchical type of evaluation?
yes = 5 too early to tell = 1

15. Approximately how many man-hours are involved in completing the peer evaluation procedure each year? How many librarians are evaluated under this system? How often are librarians evaluated?
72 hours for 28 librarians reviewed twice a year.
300 hours for 18 cases.
600 hours plus study of documentation for 100 librarians.
too many hours for 70 librarians reviewed annually.
no estimate for 60 librarians reviewed annually.
no estimate for 140 librarians reviewed annually.

APPENDIX VI

LIBRARY ORGANIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE
July 30, 1973

Sent to 26 libraries; the results are not tabulable.

A. The Library and the University

1. To whom does the library director report within the university? Has he or she a title other than Library Director or University Librarian, etc.?
2. Which university bodies determine library policy? Who serves on these bodies?
3. Do any librarians have faculty status? If some, but not all, librarians have faculty status, what criteria are used to grant status?
4. How many librarians serve on university committees and subcommittees? On faculty committees or subcommittees?
5. What are the channels of communication, both formal and informal, between librarians and faculty?

B. The Organization of the Library

1. Number of professionals on the library staff? Number of non-professionals on the library staff?
2. What is the organizational structure of the library? Please send chart or description, if available.
3. Have there been any major changes in the organizational structure of the library within the last 5 years? If so, please explain.
4. Is there any organization to which all professional librarians belong? (If answer is "yes", please send bylaws and/or description of organization; if "no", omit numbers 5 and 6.)
5. Does this organization have a policy making role in the library? Please explain.
6. What are the officers and committees of this organization? How are they selected?

7. Are individual librarians responsible for structuring and scheduling their own work? Please explain.

8. Does your University recognize a bargaining agent for any or all your staff?

9. To what degree is there staff participation (both professional and non-professional) in the administration of the library?

10. What channels of communication are used for input in policy decisions and dissemination of information on policy decisions?

C. Independent Campus Libraries (please answer if applicable)

1. Which if any libraries on campus are administratively independent of the main library system? To whom do the heads of these libraries report?

2. Are policies and procedures of the independent libraries consistent with those of the main library system?

3. If there is a campus librarians' organization (B4), do librarians in the independent libraries belong to the organization?

4. Do librarians in the independent libraries participate in the administration of their own libraries?

5. What are the channels of communication between these libraries and the main library system? Between their librarians and other campus librarians?

APPENDIX VII

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The libraries at Stanford are organized into seven distinct administrative structures. These consist of the University Libraries; the Law Library; the Lane Medical Library; the Library of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace; the Food Research Institute Library; the J. Hugh Jackson Library of Business; and the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) Library. Each unit reports directly to a different University officer (54). The University Library Council and the Acquisitions Council provide policy coordination. Overall assessment of the general health and direction of library development is provided by the Visiting Committee of the Stanford University Libraries, which makes recommendations to the President of the University.

These administrative structures have evolved because autonomy was encouraged in the development of specialized resources and their utilization. A brief description and history of the administrative development of the libraries at Stanford and the place of librarians in the University is necessary in order to understand the present situation.

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

The University Libraries consists of the Main Library with its numerous branches (55). The Director of Libraries reports directly to the Provost. In addition, the Committee on Libraries of the Academic Council assists in the determination of policy of the Libraries (56).

When instruction began at Stanford in 1891, the collection in the University Libraries consisted of only 3,000 volumes, housed in one room

---

54) See Table 9.

55) The branches are the Art and Architecture Library, Swain Chemistry Library, Computer Sciences Library, Cubberley Education Library, Branner Earth Sciences Library, Engineering Library, Falconer Biology Library, Mathematical Sciences Library, Music Library, and Physics Library.

56) Although the Committee on Libraries is charged with the formulation of "policies concerning the character and use of the entire library collections of the University," it traditionally exercises this responsibility with respect only to the University Libraries. See Charge to the Committee on Libraries, Stanford, Senate of the Academic Council, 1971.

in the Quadrangle. Despite the financial stringency following Leland Stanford's death in 1893, the library grew rapidly through the extensive collections received from Timothy Hopkins, Thomas Welton Stanford (Leland's brother), and the first University President, David Starr Jordan. Within a short time, the original quarters were overcrowded, and departments were encouraged to maintain collections related to their disciplines consisting of books on extended loan from the library. These collections were further augmented by departmental funds.

In 1901 the central collection was moved to the new, but already too small, Thomas Welton Stanford Library, the current location of the Law School. A new library was begun on the present site of the Jackson School of Business, but before it could be occupied, it was destroyed by the 1906 earthquake. The excessively crowded conditions persisted until the opening of the present Main Library in 1919. However, the pattern of departmental collections financed by departmental funds was so firmly established that it continued.

Conflicts were inevitable in a system in which the University Librarian was responsible for the library collections while departments purchased their own books and, in some cases, hired their own librarians. By 1924 "the title of the Librarian was changed from Librarian to Director of University Libraries. This was deemed desirable because of the growing importance of such collections as the Lane Medical Library, Hoover War Library, Branner Geological Library, and the Law Library, each with its librarian" (57). The next year the Director's responsibilities were further defined: "The recommendation from the Academic Council that Chapter IX, page 18, of the Articles of Organization of the Faculty be amended by adding the following clause, was approved: Section 4: Librarians or curators of departmental or special libraries employed primarily for the care and administration of such libraries shall be nominated for appointment by the Director of the University Libraries and shall be under his general supervision and control" (58).

The splintering of the libraries was an indication of major administrative problems which had become so acute by 1946 that the American Library Association was asked to survey the situation. Louis Round Wilson and Raynard C. Swank undertook the study and concluded that "the present central library administration was found to be too weak to serve adequately the interests of all instructional and research departments" (59). They recommended that all units be placed under the

---

57) Stanford University. Annual Report of the President. (Stanford: 1924), p.12.

58) Ibid., 1925, p.55.

59) Wilson, Louis R., and Raynard C. Swank. Report of a Survey of the Library of Stanford University for Stanford University, November 1946-March 1947. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1947), p.207. Hereafter referred to as Wilson/Swank.

administration of a strengthened Director of University Libraries. The decentralization of library funding, a major aspect of the fragmentation of the libraries, was also criticized. They recommended that centralized accounting within the University Libraries be established for all libraries.

As a result of that study, a major reorganization of the libraries was undertaken in 1947/48. While many of the recommendations were implemented, a choice between full integration with the University Libraries or continued autonomy was given to the separately maintained libraries. Business, Law, Food Research Institute, and Hoover Institution chose autonomy, as did Lane Medical Library when it moved to campus.

New administratively autonomous collections which have emerged in the ensuing years have not been a result of splintering, but rather of the process of creation. The SLAC Library is the most apparent example in which a collection employing librarians for its maintenance was created for a specific project and has grown with that project. Collections which are outside the Coordinate or University Libraries systems include the Art Department's Slide Library, the Education and Research Development collection, the ERIC Clearinghouse, the Engineering Department's Energy Information Center, and about 40 seminar, laboratory, and office collections.

COORDINATE LIBRARIES

The Coordinate Libraries encompass the remaining autonomously administered libraries (60). The Law Library is the oldest coordinate library; in 1901 the University Librarian's Annual Report stated that the "Law Library now occupies a separate building from the University Library and is to all intents and purposes separately managed, though under the general care of the University Librarian" (61). By 1946, just before achieving full autonomy, the Law Library had a staff of one professional, one clerical, and seven students. Its funds were under the control of the Dean of the Law School, although the Law Librarian reported to the Director of University Libraries (62).

In 1910 the Cooper Medical School and the Lane Medical Library in San Francisco became a part of Stanford University. The library, which contained 35,000 volumes and had an ample endowment, was to be administered by the Librarian of the University in consultation with the

---

60) The term Coordinate Library was devised in 1970 by David C. Weber, Director of University Libraries, to describe those libraries with separate administrations.

61) Stanford University. University Librarian's Annual Report. (Stanford: 1901), p.6.

62) Stanford University. University Libraries. Annual Report of the Director. (Stanford: 1947).

Faculty of the Medical School. This relationship continued until the move to Stanford in the 1960's (63), when the Lane Medical Library separated from the University Libraries administration and the Lane librarian assumed administrative control while continuing to consult with the Medical School Faculty.

In November, 1921, the Hoover War Library was established with a nucleus collection donated to the University by Herbert Hoover. Its charter specified that the Directors of Hoover Institution were to be concerned with its library's policy. Initially housed on the first floor of the Main Library, it did not have its own quarters until 1941. In September, 1946, the total administrative responsibility of the library passed to the Directors of the Institution (64). The Hoover Institution's growth through the 1960's paralleled the University's.

The Food Research Institute was also created in November, 1921. Its library was separately maintained until 1933, when the Directors of the Institute asked the University Libraries to administer it. This arrangement continued until 1947, when the Food Research Institute Library became quasi-autonomous. The library was separately administered under the Institute, while the University Libraries agreed to continue to order and process its materials.

In 1925, the Graduate School of Business was established. It was very successful in acquiring operating monies and developed its own library. Although the library was responsible for its own administration, acquisitions, and staff, its cataloging was done by the University Libraries for a fee of 10% of the cost of each item processed. When the new J. Hugh Jackson Library of Business opened in 1966, it began cataloging its own acquisitions.

In 1956, SLAC opened under the operation of the Atomic Energy Commission. The library grew much the same way as other autonomous

---

63) The Medical School housing the Lane Medical Library opened on the Stanford campus in 1963. Cf. Stanford University. University Libraries. Annual Report of the Director. (Stanford: 1964).

64) "The administrative organization of the Institution and its relation to the University are set forth in a Stanford Board of Trustees resolution adopted in May, 1959. The resolution states that the Institution is 'an independent Institution within the frame of Stanford University ... The Director shall be responsible through the President of the University, to the Trustees for: a. recommending appointments to and supervising the staff of the Institution; b. directing and supervising the library functions of the Institution, which include acquisitions, processing and cataloging, use and security of the collections and reference materials; c. directing and supervising the research and publication program of the Institution; d. preparing and administrating the annual budget of the Institution.'" Stanford University. Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. (Stanford, 1963) p.12.

libraries within the University structure: a few shelves of pertinent books purchased with project funds expanded into a full-scale library with a separate administration under SLAC. By the mid-1960's, the library had outgrown its original quarters and had moved into its present building (65).

LIBRARIANS

The professional staff of the libraries has grown from one librarian in 1891 (Edwin Hamlin Woodruff) to around 150 in 1975. There was no well developed classification scheme nor appointment criteria for librarians in the early years of the library system. Consequently, by 1946 Wilson and Swank reported that the staff of the libraries "regardless of qualification or type of work, are generally viewed as belonging in the same category. The result is that work of a truly professional character is not always recognized or rewarded as such" (66). In general, too, they found that departmental librarians were involved in much nonprofessional work. "A divisional librarian," they said in their observations on the Biological Science Library, "according to the plan proposed in this report, should not be confined to desk duty in any library but should have time for consultation with the faculty, the staffs of the various departmental libraries in his charge, and the Main Library staff, and for work in whatever unit demands his services from day to day" (67).

The Wilson/Swank report recommended that a ranking and pay scale be established which appropriately distinguished between professional and clerical positions. As a result of the report, librarians were classified as Librarian, Senior Librarian, Principal Librarian, and Chief Librarian, with distinctions in rank based upon degree of administrative responsibility. In 1959 these titles were replaced with the current numerical ranking system, Librarian I through IV. Ten years later, in response to the complaint that the criteria for promotion had become vague, a committee of SULA was established to review the system and recommended that administrative responsibility should not be the sole criterion for promotion, but that subject competence should also be a significant consideration.

Another problem of mutual concern to librarians was their status in the University community. As measured by Academic Council membership, their status has fluctuated considerably over the years. Initially, only the University Librarian was a member. At the meeting of the Academic Council on April 23, 1920, a resolution was passed "that members of the Library Staff be given classification and such status on

---

65) Stanford University. University Libraries. Annual Report of the Director. (Stanford: 1964) refers to SLAC Library's new building.

66) Wilson/Swank, p.134.

67) Ibid., p.125.

the Academic Staff as their salaries may justify" (68). This was later clarified when the Academic Council determined "that members of the Library Staff receiving the salary of an Assistant Professor, and who have been for three years on a salary of $1,800 or more, be made members of the Academic Council" (68). The three year period was identical with the faculty requirement for Council membership. In 1945 the Academic Council dropped all librarians, except the Director of Libraries, from membership. However, librarians continued as members of the University Staff, with the status of academic personnel (70). In 1970, when the Academic Council reviewed its qualifications for membership, it recommended that the consideration of librarians be delayed until the nature of their jobs could be more fully determined. In 1974, the Committee on the Professoriate also reviewed qualifications for admission to the Academic Council and proposed a more restrictive membership.

SULA was formed in September, 1969, in order to increase participation in professional matters and to facilitate more effective communication among librarians in the University Libraries and the Coordinate Libraries. Its membership consists of any dues-paying Stanford librarian, curator, or library intern. Its purposes are to:

a. present topics of interest to the profession of librarianship at Stanford, and in general
b. enhance communication among librarians at Stanford,
c. promote a better understanding of the role of the libraries at Stanford University, and
d. provide a forum for discussion of matters of common concern to Stanford librarians (71).

While it has significantly contributed to communication among Stanford librarians and has developed several excellent reviews of specific aspects of librarianship at Stanford (notably a draft statement on security of employment and a revised classification system), it has not been very effective because of the lack of administrative support among the libraries.

---

68) Stanford University. President. Annual Report. (Stanford: 1920), p.46.

68) *Ibid.*, 1925, p.54.

70) Wilson/Swank, p.141.

71) Stanford University Librarians Association. Constitution. (Stanford: 1969).

APPENDIX VIII

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are repeated from the body of the text. For ease of reference, the heading of the section in which each appeared follows the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 1 (II)

A Librarians' Assembly should be created which would automatically include in its membership all professionals employed at Stanford in the Librarian or Library Director series. Other professional classifications in the libraries may be admitted as members of the Assembly upon recommendation of its Executive Board and approval by the Assembly.

I. PURPOSES OF THE ASSEMBLY:
  A. To increase communication among librarians of the University.
  B. To provide a forum for discussion and exploration of issues of concern to librarians.
  C. To provide all librarians in the various libraries of the University with a regular and effective means of participating in the formulation of policies and procedures which affect the role and recognition of librarians.
  D. To discuss and make recommendations in the following areas to the chief administrative officers of the libraries of the University:
    1. Appointments, promotions, grievances, and security of employment.
    2. Librarians' welfare and development.
    3. Library policy and planning.
    4. Selection and development of collections.
    5. Public services.
    6. Technical services.
  E. To represent the library to the Academic Council of the University in order that librarians may participate more actively in the governance of the University.

II. EXECUTIVE BOARD:
  A. The Executive Board of the Librarians' Assembly should be elected by the Assembly.
  B. All members of the Executive Board should be elected for two-year terms with one-half of the Board elected for a one-year term when the Assembly is begun.
  C. No one in the Library Director series should be eligible for election to the Board.

D. The Executive Board should include mandatory representation of librarians from the Coordinate Libraries.

E. Functions of the Executive Board:

1. To call and conduct meetings of the Assembly.
2. To set the agenda for the meetings of the Assembly.
3. To establish ad hoc committees and appoint members to both standing and ad hoc committees.
4. To serve as an advisory board to the Director of Libraries and the chief administrative officers of the Coordinate Libraries. All Assembly and committee recommendations should be transmitted to the Director of Libraries and chief administrative officers through the Executive Board.
5. To propose and develop bylaws.

F. The Executive Board should meet at least once a month and conduct the business of the Assembly between its general meetings.

III. FUNDING:

The University Libraries and the Coordinate Libraries should cover basic and necessary operating expenses of the Assembly on a proportional basis. Members should not be required to pay dues, and all meetings and Assembly business could be conducted on library time.

IV. MEETINGS:

A. The Librarians' Assembly should meet at least once every quarter. Special meetings should be called by the Executive Board, or as a result of a petition signed by 25% of the Assembly, or at the request of the University Library Council.

B. The Director of University Libraries and the chief administrative officers of the Coordinate Libraries should annually report to the Assembly on the state of the libraries.

C. The Executive Board should submit a written agenda for the general meetings of the Librarians' Assembly to the membership at least two working days in advance of the meeting.

V. COMMITTEES:

A. The Assembly should establish the following standing committees:

1. The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment should participate in the selection and appointment process for librarians, and establish and administer a peer review system for promotions and for security of employment.
2. The Committee on Professional Development should be concerned with coordination of staff development activities among all the campus libraries. This committee should devise a uniform policy of staff development for professionals, disseminate information on staff development, and make recommendations on requests for professional leaves and travel funds.

3. The Committee on Public and Technical Services should review on a regular basis the utilization of staff, and the goals and objectives of public and technical service units, recommending improvement of services based upon this review; and coordinate public and technical service activities of the campus libraries.
4. The Committee on Library Instruction should supervise and coordinate an effective program of library instruction for all of Stanford's libraries.
5. The Committee on Committees should review the standing committees each year, consider recommendations for new standing committees, and propose appointments to committees.

B. The Assembly may recommend the creation of special and ad hoc committees to the Executive Board. These recommendations should be referred to the Committee on Committees.

VI. POWERS OF THE ASSEMBLY:

All recommendations of the Assembly should be considered advisory. The final power to change policies and procedures remains with the University and the library administrations. It is the intention of the Commission that the Assembly encourage active participation of all librarians in the decision making processes of the libraries in order to give them a voice in the determination of policies which affect their role as professionals.

RECOMMENDATION 2 (III.D)

A coherent and logically organized program of library instruction should be developed by the Stanford University Libraries and the Coordinate Libraries. This program should be supervised and coordinated by a Library Instruction Committee representative of all the major library units. Library I should be continued and vigorously promoted, and instructors should be drawn from all interested and qualified librarians. The present involvement of librarians in departmental teaching programs should also be actively encouraged. For librarians solely responsible for teaching a course, a minimum of 25% of their work load should be allocated to this important effort. Apportionate time should be allocated for team teaching. The ideal should be a broad range of instructional assignments, methods, and materials to insure the most effective utilization of the library's resources by its patrons.

RECOMMENDATION 3 (III.F)

Given the complex nature of Stanford's libraries, good management is essential for the effective functioning of the production-oriented library operations and for the facilitation of the proper role of professionals. To promote good management practices, the Commission recommends the following:

1. Every effort should be made to increase responsible staff involvement in decision making and to institute participatory management throughout the libraries. Participatory management, as

envisioned by the Commission, would include the following elements:

a. Decisions should be made at the level of responsibility whenever possible.

b. Input, ideas, opinions, and feedback from the staff should be sought whenever major new policies, changes, reorganizations, or plans are contemplated. Major decisions (e.g., procedural changes and new policies) should be made after consultation with those affected, rather than by mandate from the top.

c. On major policies affecting the role or status of librarians, the Executive Board of the Librarians' Assembly should serve as an advisory group to assure that the professional aspects and implications of the policy are presented and taken into consideration.

2. For the most effective utilization of personnel, all areas not involving professional judgment and decision making should be the province of the support staff. To assure and reward excellence among the support staff, paraprofessional positions should be provided for areas requiring highly competent performance and the assumption of substantial responsibilities. The Commission recommends that each major library unit establish its own ad hoc committee to determine the most effective ratio of support staff to professional staff in each library. Each committee should be composed of members from the units concerned, including librarians, support staff, and administration.

3. In order to develop and effectively utilize supervisory and managerial skills, the libraries should inaugurate a continuing management training program. This program, administered by the Library Personnel Office for all the libraries and with the advice of the Professional Development Committee of the Librarians' Assembly, should comprise the following elements:

   a. In-house "local situation" workshops dealing with Library and University forms, regulations, procedures, and policies should be offered on a regular basis to staff members with supervisory responsibilities. Additional workshops should be organized to cover special situations such as major changes in library or University policies.

   b. Management training, supported by the University's Staff Training Assistance Program funds or by library monies set aside for this purpose, should be more actively encouraged for any staff member seriously considering a supervisory or managerial career in the libraries.

   c. Management training should be mandatory for staff members in positions requiring substantial managerial skills. These positions include department heads, assistant department heads, branch librarians, division heads, and supervisors of three or more full time equivalent employees.

4. A hierarchy is not the only viable form of organization for libraries and, in fact, some units could function more effectively with (and librarians themselves could benefit from) a more collegial type of organization. Therefore, the Commission

recommends that at least one department or library experiment with a collegial arrangement for the next three to five years. Under a collegial arrangement (a form of organization commonly used in academic departments) decisions are made by a group of peers headed by an elected chairperson. In the library the peer group should comprise all professionals in a particular unit. The individual selected as chairperson should be paid an administrative stipend for the length of time in that position. This arrangement should not preclude participation by support staff in the management of the unit. It should, however, encourage involvement and the sharing of administrative duties and responsibilities among the professional staff.

RECOMMENDATION 4 (IV.A.1)

The Commission recommends the following criteria for appointment to the Librarian series:

1. Librarian (Beginning or Librarian I). An MLS from an American Library Association accredited library school or equivalent library training. Reading knowledge of at least one but preferably two foreign languages. Graduate work, master's degree or doctorate in a related subject field is highly desirable.
2. Librarian (other than beginning). Meet the requirements of beginning librarian in addition to demonstrated competence in previous professional position(s), outstanding recommendations and involvement in professional organizations and activities.

The Commission recommends the following criteria for appointment to library administrative and management positions (Assistant Department Chief and above):

1. Must have had some formal management training or agree to complete at least one management course during the first year of employment.
2. Should have demonstrated or potential administrative, managerial, or supervisory abilities.
3. Should have an MLS degree or enough experience in library work to understand library operations, relationships, and terminology.

Those not meeting the criteria for appointment to beginning Librarian should not be given the title or rank of Librarian nor should they be responsible for performance appraisals of librarians.

RECOMMENDATION 5 (IV.A.2)

Since librarians classed above Librarian I are appointed as the result of national or international searches and extensive interviewing, the appointment should appropriately go via the Provost and be confirmed by the Board of Trustees. A document of appointment should be signed by the Secretary to the Board of Trustees, giving the term of appointment and the title or classification of the librarian as an "academic officer" of the University. This form of appointment would help substantially to remove the implication that librarians serve in a subordinate position, rather than in a professional one. A form of appointment that is essentially the same as the faculty's would recognize the status and function of the librarian as an academic colleague of the faculty.

RECOMMENDATION 6 (IV.A.3)

After studying alternative classifications, the Commission concluded that the present system, adequately defined, would properly fulfill the requirements of an effective classification with a minimum of disruption. In general, the proposed system is designed to provide all librarians with the opportunity to advance into the highest classification through increased professional competence.

LIBRARIAN I. The beginning professional level.
CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT: The criteria stated in Section IV.A.1, above, should be met. No experience is required, and appointees to this rank will have no more than three years of professional experience.
YEARS IN RANK: The librarian can expect to remain in this grade an average of two years and a maximum of three years. No librarian shall begin a third year in this rank without a clear understanding of the level of achievement expected in order to be promoted to the next rank. If not promoted at the end of three years, the librarian will be given six months' notice and will be expected to leave the service of the library.
CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS CLASSIFIED IN THIS RANK: Performs a variety of professional duties under careful supervision in preparation for more independent responsibility. Ideally, incumbents in this grade would acquire experience through rotating assignments in acquisitions, cataloging, public service, and administration.

The following ranks are all career grades and a librarian may remain in any one indefinitely. However, promotion from Librarian II to Librarian IV should normally occur in ten years.

LIBRARIAN II. The first career grade in the Librarian series.
CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT: In addition to the criteria stated in Section IV.A.1, above, the following is desirable: equivalent rank in the previous position or a minimum of two years of professional experience. Advanced degrees relevant to the job assignment can fulfill a part of the years of experience criterion.
YEARS IN RANK: The librarian can expect to remain in this rank a minimum of two years or an average of five years before promotion.
CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS CLASSIFIED IN THIS RANK: Majority of duties are performed independently. Some management of other professionals can be expected. This rank involves subject specialization as well as application of professional library procedures.

LIBRARIAN III. The second career grade in the Librarian series.
CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT: In addition to the criteria stated in Section IV.A.1, above, the following is desirable: equivalent rank in the previous position or a minimum of four years of professional

experience. Advanced degrees relevant to the job assignment can fulfill a part of the years of experience criterion.

YEARS IN RANK: The librarian can expect to remain in this rank a minimum of two years or an average of five years before promotion.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS CLASSIFIED IN THIS RANK: Performs complex professional duties with independence. Does original cataloging and classification of difficult material, engages in advanced reference work which involves consultation with faculty, or performs specialized services (e.g., as instructor or curator), administers a division of the library, manages a branch library, assists chief of a department.

LIBRARIAN IV. The final career grade in the Librarian series.

CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT: In addition to the criteria stated in Section IV.A.1, above, the following is desirable: a master's or higher degree in a subject field, and equivalent rank in the previous position or a minimum of six years of professional experience. Advanced degrees relevant to the job assignment can fulfill a part of the years of experience criterion.

YEARS IN RANK: The librarian can expect to remain in this rank permanently.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS CLASSIFIED IN THIS RANK: Makes unique professional contributions (e.g., evidences expertise in the resources of a specialized subject, form, language, or geographic area), does complex analytical work on procedures for major aspects of a library's operation, or has substantial administrative responsibilities (e.g., administers a department of a library).

RECOMMENDATION 7 (IV.A.4)

The Commission recommends:

1. That the Stanford librarians' market be defined as university, college, and research libraries in the San Francisco Bay Area. This list should include libraries in the University of California system, the California State Universities and Colleges system, the various community colleges, and special libraries. Stanford competes with these libraries for qualified professional staff, and positions in these libraries are similar in scope and requirements to positions at Stanford. Also, the cost-of-living factors in the Bay Area are comparable. The high-market position would include most government libraries, i.e., federal, state, and metropolitan area public libraries.

2. That Stanford University librarians' salaries be upgraded to the level of comparable professional salaries in this area: 30% increase across the board retroactive to September 1, 1974.

3. That the libraries of Stanford University aim for a mid-market salary position and that an overall percentage increase be made annually to compensate for market factors.

4. That the present compensation system be replaced by a published structure.

5. That librarians be assigned as follows to the C-Ranges: LI-LIV to the C-6 through C-9 ranges.

6. That the new structure allow for higher salaries when promotion occurs or additional responsibilities are assumed, in addition to the expected annual merit increase.

7. That the new structure place librarians in an equitable salary position to the San Francisco Bay Area market and to other professionals at Stanford with comparable requirements and contributions.

RECOMMENDATION 8 (IV.A.5)

1. The Commission recommends flexible work scheduling for librarians, whenever it is compatible with the basic daily operations of the library. It does so in the conviction that not only is this measure of independence inseparable from professional status but that its implementation will promote higher morale and improve library efficiency.

2. Overcrowding can be alleviated to some extent by flexible time scheduling, which would decrease the number of people in an office at any given time. It would also allow work requiring concentration to be done in a place other than the library.

3. Even with the present limited space, improvements can be made. Plans for new library buildings must include greater consideration of staff space needs in terms of both quantity and quality.

   a. Librarians should have access to their work areas whenever the library building is open. Keys should be available for check-out at public service desks by those who have not been issued their own.

   b. Present work space should be examined to determine the need for and feasibility of providing partitions around desks, particularly in very large work areas.

   c. A number of study carrels should be available for use by librarians.

   d. In dealing with the University concerning space assignments, the libraries should strongly express and support the need for appropriate and adequate office and conference space for professional staff.

   e. The Librarians' Assembly should be involved in plans for new library buildings. The ultimate structures will benefit from the variety of viewpoints and expertise available among librarians, resulting in efficient storage of library materials as well as a congenial environment conducive to professional work and research.

RECOMMENDATION 9 (IV.A.6)

To insure that termination of Stanford librarians is for unsatisfactory performance, and not for reasons such as defending intellectual freedom, espousing unpopular causes, sustaining ideological differences, or questioning administrative decisions, a system of security of employment should be established. To accomplish this, a committee of the Librarians' Assembly should be formed to write a detailed document on security of employment that incorporates the basic elements listed in paragraph two of the citation from Johnson's Career Status and Tenure in Section IV.A.6. This document should be based on 1) the Association of College and Research Libraries Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians and 2) the Stanford University Librarians Association's Security of Employment statement.

RECOMMENDATION 10 (IV.A.7)

A peer review process is deemed important for the development of a strong collegial profession; therefore, the Commission recommends that all Stanford librarians be included in such a process.

The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment of the Librarians' Assembly should review all permanent appointments, promotions and elevations to career status.

The Committee should consist of five members appointed for overlapping two-year terms by the Executive Board of the Librarians' Assembly in consultation with the chief administrative officers (e.g., Director, Librarian) of the participating libraries.

The Committee should make recommendations to the chief administrative officer of the appropriate library based upon documentation supplied by the supervisor(s) and the librarian being reviewed. The librarian should be informed of the recommendations made at each level of the procedure.

Documentation should include a written evaluation by the supervisor, which must occur at intervals of no more than three years nor less than six months. Within those limits, evaluations should be obligatory for any of the following reasons:

1. Librarian's request
2. Change in job assignment
3. Change in supervisor
4. Recommendation for promotion or elevation to career status
5. Supervisor's request
6. Library administration's request

The evaluation should be concerned with job performance (75%) and professional development (25%).

The review process for promotion should normally be initiated by a supervisor's recommendation, but librarians should have the option to request their own promotion review. Elevation to career status should be considered on a timetable to be devised by the Librarians' Assembly.

The Committee should have the authority to appoint ad hoc promotion review committees which would report their findings to the Committee. The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment would judge the qualifications of only the final candidates for appointment to the Librarian series.

RECOMMENDATION 11 (IV.A.8)

An appeals procedure should be set up for librarians which would cover such problems as dissatisfaction over appointments, promotions, reassignments, security of employment (or career status), and allocation of travel funds. A committee of peers would hear and judge the appeal and pass on their judgment to a source outside of the libraries, such as the Provost's Office. The specific mechanics of the procedure should be worked out and voted on by the Librarians' Assembly.

RECOMMENDATION 12 (IV.B)

To insure that professional development opportunities are well publicized and made available to all librarians at Stanford, a Committee on Professional Development should be established by the Librarians' Assembly. This committee would be concerned with the coordination and planning of professional development activities for all campus libraries.

RECOMMENDATION 13 (IV.B.1)

The existing orientation programs should certainly be continued, but to insure that all librarians at Stanford, including those in the Coordinate Libraries, have the opportunity to participate, the Committee on Professional Development of the Librarians' Assembly should establish a comprehensive orientation program.

RECOMMENDATION 14 (IV.B.2)

The Commission strongly recommends that the University Libraries provide a career counseling service for all librarians at Stanford and that its Personnel Officer have training in this field.

RECOMMENDATION 15 (IV.B.3)

The Commission urges that all University libraries continue to encourage the development and effectiveness of the staff by providing funds for appropriate visits and travel for all librarians, and by increasing the amount of funds allocated for travel reimbursement.

For equitable application of policies regarding travel reimbursement, the Commission recommends that the Committee on Professional Development of the Librarians' Assembly be responsible for reviewing requests for travel funds.

RECOMMENDATION 16 (IV.B.4)

Professional leave should be made available to all librarians who have career status and have been at Stanford for a minimum of three years. They should be encouraged to make use of it, particularly in the early stages of their careers. A librarian should be eligible for three months professional leave at full salary, or six months at half salary, at intervals of three years. The leave may be used for research or innovation in librarianship or in an academic subject area, or otherwise to pursue a program of professional development that full time employment does not permit.

Professional leave is not free time that comes as a matter of course, like a vacation. There should be a well defined purpose and a written statement of what the applicant expects to accomplish. Because increased expertise is a sufficient end in itself, the product of the leave need not be a written or published document of any kind.

Application should be made by the librarian through administrative channels. At least three copies of the proposal and accompanying forms should be made, one for the administration, one for the Committee on Professional Development of the Librarians' Assembly, and one for the applicant's records. The Committee on Professional Development should act in an advisory capacity to the library administration in the decision making process.

RECOMMENDATION 17 (IV.B.5)

All librarians, regardless of rank, should be encouraged to take courses, at Stanford or at other institutions, for credit or audit, and to pursue advanced degrees.

As professionals, they should be responsible for determining their own hours of time off for purposes of continuing education.

Assistance, in terms of time and money, should be provided to the fullest extent possible. Tuition assistance should be available to librarians taking courses during professional leaves.

Area of study should not be limited to subjects pertinent to the individual's present job assignment, but should allow room for growth in other directions as well.

RECOMMENDATION 18 (IV.C.1)

All librarians who teach formal courses should be given academic title and rank, at least during their term of appointment. For those librarians teaching courses not sponsored by an academic department, ranks and titles could be granted through the Humanities Special Programs.

RECOMMENDATION 19 (IV.C.2)

In order to facilitate communication, to improve relationships with the faculty, and to give librarians a more direct voice in the governance of the University, the Commission recommends that representation of librarians in the Academic Council be increased. To achieve this an ad hoc committee of the Librarians' Assembly should be established to work out appropriate criteria and methods.

RECOMMENDATION 20 (IV.C.3)

The Commission recommends that the practice of appointing librarians to University Committees be continued and increased to give more librarians this type of opportunity to serve the academic community. In addition, librarians should be invited to participate fully on the committees of the Academic Council.

RECOMMENDATION 21 (IV.C.4)

The Commission believes that it is important for librarians to take the initiative in increasing faculty-librarian contact. One way in which this could be accomplished is by appointing a librarian (preferably one with an advanced subject degree) as a selector for each academic department. The librarian and the faculty could discuss library needs and problems and communicate any new programs or specialties which might have an impact on their mutual areas of interest. Such dialogue, even in a formal way, would lead to better understanding and the accomplishment of common goals.

RECOMMENDATION 22 (IV.D.1)

The University Affirmative Action Officer, an unbiased source outside the libraries, should be formally requested to review the situation of women in all the Stanford University libraries. The Librarians' Assembly should appoint an ad hoc Committee on Affirmative Action to investigate the status and problems of librarians who are women and/or members of minority groups, and this committee should report its findings and recommendations to the Assembly.

RECOMMENDATION 23 (IV.D.2)

1. The standards and procedures for appointment, promotion, security of employment, and grievance should be uniformly applied to all librarians at Stanford regardless of their place of assignment. The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Security of Employment of the Librarians' Assembly should oversee the uniform application of this recommendation.

2. Because of the belief that standards are important in assuring consistency and quality of service among the libraries, the Commission recommends that a committee of the Librarians' Assembly be established (the Committee on Public and Technical Services) to propose minimum standards of service.

3. A formal University interlibrary orientation program, run by the Librarians' Assembly, should be established to enable librarians to learn more about Stanford early in their employment.

4. The Librarians' Assembly, to which all librarians would belong, should also further the exchange of information and ideas and encourage all librarians at Stanford to work together toward common goals.